Boston Public Library
3 9999 10589 548 4

PER. RM.

No. AP2.N7

V.149

1889

39-3

THE

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

RE-ESTABLISHED BY ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

EDITED BY LLOYD BRYCE.

VOL. CXLIX.

Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

NEW YORK:
No. 3 EAST FOURTEENTH STREET.
1889.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
NOV 10 1964

Pa. Dept
*AP2
.N7
Vol. 149

B/2d/12

COPYRIGHT BY
LLOYD BRYCE.
1889.

14.6450
Apr. 1, 1890,
693.1
Vol. 149

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXCII.

JULY, 1889.

DISCIPLINE IN AMERICAN COLLEGES.

BY PRESIDENT BARTLETT OF DARTMOUTH, PRESIDENT ANGELL OF MICHIGAN, PROFESSOR SHALER OF HARVARD, PRESIDENT ADAMS OF CORNELL, PRESIDENT HYDE OF BOWDOIN, PRINCIPAL DAWSON OF M'GILL, AND PRESIDENT DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA.

How far should a university control its students? The inquiry relates, of course, to the American, and not the European, university. The latter is quite a different institution from the former. The German university may be summarily characterized as a cluster of professional schools, preceded by the long (seven years) and rigid drill of the gymnasium. Oxford and Cambridge stand in a somewhat similar relation to such an elaborate training as is given at Winchester and Rugby. Of these universities it may be remarked in passing that they are sufficiently inflexible in the courses of study they prescribe and the amount of attendance they require for their degrees, and rigid in regard to some matters of conduct, though lax enough in others.

The American university is a very different affair. The name covers a variety of institutions, no one of which fully corresponds to the European one. Some of them have nothing of the foreign university character, but only the gymnasium or college elements, which, indeed, greatly predominate in our largest so-called universities, and are not wholly eliminated from Johns Hopkins.

Our universities being predominantly colleges, and the great majority of their students being under-graduates or college students, I propose to direct my suggestions to the question of controlling college students, with reference to whom primarily and almost exclusively it has been publicly raised. The proposition that the university student should choose his own studies and govern himself was originally applied to a body of young men the majority of whom were not properly university students.

It may be admitted that professional students are to some degree in different circumstances from college students. They are older and more mature; mostly men in years and experience. They have gone through an invaluable previous training, have a wider horizon of knowledge, and are held and urged by the near prospects of their life-work and the impending necessity of a livelihood. They should require much less of external guidance and control. Yet they are not left to themselves. Professional schools of all kinds firmly hold their students to certain prescribed courses of lectures, reading, examinations, and attendance, which are accepted by all parties as wise and necessary, and on which no further remark is here called for.

Students enter college mostly in the transition period from boyhood to manhood. Perhaps the average age in this country is not far from eighteen years. Some, indeed, are men, but very many are still boys. As a body they are at an age when, during nearly three-quarters of their college course, they are, by the wise laws of the land, under parental government. This patent fact alone would seem to furnish a valid basis for the answer to the question. I have heard it affirmed by a high college official that the notion of a college faculty standing *in loco parentis* is an exploded notion. If so, the more the pity. But there certainly are colleges, not a few, where it is not exploded or obsolete. By what right shall the parent, when he sends his son into new difficulties and temptations, consent to the withdrawal of all that guardian watch and care which the public polity and the wisdom of ages require of him while the son is at home? And by what right shall the institution to which the young man in his minority is entrusted by the parent assume that not only direct parental guardianship, but all substitute for it, is abrogated by the trust? I have heard it asserted, in a similar strain, that the whole duty of a college professor is discharged and ended in the lecture-room.

If these two maxims were settled principles in all our colleges, judicious parents might well hesitate, and even refuse, to send their sons to such places of irresponsibility. Better place them in any kind of apprenticeship, for then they would be held to duty and responsibility. But such views do not universally prevail. In many of our best institutions the personal influence of the instructors is even more efficient outside of the lecture-room than within it; and most institutions feel the obligation, so far as practicable, to supply the parent's moral influence, while furnishing the intellectual influences which he could not personally bestow. Otherwise the transition from the well-regulated home to the heartless institution would be the saddest of orphanages.

Furthermore, the clear underlying principle of the student's position carries with it the condition of control. He goes to college to be equipped for the thinking and acting of manhood. He goes unformed, inexperienced, susceptible, exposed, comparatively crude in judgments, and often abounding in juvenile tendencies to irregularity and excess. Now, are such young men to be coolly left to themselves, unaided by external supports? Or are they to be actively and positively helped in every available mode by the men to whom they have come for help,—by their knowledge, their experience, their riper judgment, their advice, and, so far as is needed, their wise and firm control? To ask the question is to answer it. To fail in the use of all such available influences is clearly a dereliction of duty and a breach of faith to the pupil. If the student is able to educate himself, why put himself under instructors and methods at all? For to choose one's studies and govern himself meanwhile, taken strictly, comprises the whole matter and method of education.

Let us apply these principles a little in detail. Clearly there should be a somewhat firm control of the attendance. Requirements of this nature, such as are insisted on in professional schools, are still more indispensable in the college. To form and fix habits of systematic, steady application is one of the prime benefits of a public school. The value of this one element of a right college training can hardly be overestimated. Few young men are so well established as to dispense with such regulations; the majority greatly need them; not a few would be life-long failures without them. And these regulations should require not only presence at the institution, but habitual attendance on its stated

exercises, with allowance, of course, for reasonable excuses. Regular attendance is even easier than irregular, while the difference in the permanent effect on the individual is beyond computation. For this reason nothing is gained and much is lost by an excessive allowance of "cuts"; and protracted absences from the lecture-room are never compensated for by cramming for examination. One great institution, which had allowed unwonted latitude in this respect, has already found it necessary to begin a retreat.

Equally legitimate is a general prescription of the course or courses of study. A full discussion of this subject cannot be entered upon here. But so long as some professional schools find it needful rigidly to require the main part of professional education, objections to a similar procedure in the college fall to the ground. From the fact that he has not been over the field, the youth is incompetent to judge what is the best drill and culture for him. And while diversity of ultimate aim may modify the latter part of the basal education, specialism comes soon enough when the special training begins. And those institutions seem to me wisest which reserve their electives till the last half of the college course, then introduce them sparingly, and not miscellaneously, but by coherent courses. A general and predominant introduction of electives is fruitful of evils. It perplexes the faithful student in his inexperience. It tempts and helps the average student to turn away from the studies which, by reason of his deficiencies, he most needs. It gives opportunity to the lazy student to indulge his indolence in the selection of "soft" electives. Striking and even ludicrous illustrations of these last two influences could readily be furnished, did the space permit. Other undesirable influences of the premature multiplication of electives, affecting the students as a body, have already been apprehended by some who strongly favored the system—in regard to which we may await further developments.

Regulations governing the conduct and deportment of the young men in their relations as students are also indispensable. No considerable company can get on without well-settled rules adapted to their special circumstances. To attempt it is confusion. The well-disposed majority need them for guidance, the ill-disposed minority for restraint, and all for comfort and protection. College codes have properly been made simpler than formerly, when English precedents prevailed. But firm codes are

none the less indispensable. In view of facts constantly coming to the knowledge of the public, as within a few weeks in regard to the acts of students of at least four "universities," and multitudes of facts well known to college faculties, it has a comic aspect to talk of the student's governing himself. He must be governed, wisely and kindly, but governed. He is, by his accepted condition, "under tutors and governors." The coöperation of the young men should be secured, as far as practicable, and friendly relations maintained between student and faculty. This is, happily, taking place more and more. But neither individually nor collectively are students the persons to govern. They are not there to guide and regulate, but to be guided and regulated. It belongs to their age and fundamental relation. Not myself believing in the surrender of college government to college students, I will not criticise the views of those who do. I may say, however, that so far as my observation goes, the seeming surrender is but superficial, the faculty retaining always the ultimate control, referring only what it is pleased to refer, and with a veto power behind. But however this may be, it is certain that in some institutions the students themselves advocate no such arrangement. Thus at Dartmouth College, where the general good order will probably bear a comparison with that of any other New England college of an equal number of students, not only have the young men, in their free class discussions, always decided adversely to the plan, but their college periodical, on the 19th of last April, put forth a vigorous protest against the scheme, ridiculing it as "an abortive attempt" by the "ukase of a single sentence" to transmute "impulsive youth, needing guidance and restraint," into "mature men," dominated by wisdom and principle. It affirmed that the student's daily actions give the lie to the oft-repeated statement that appeals to his honor alone are necessary, pronounced the strong government to be the one that is "respected," and ended with the assertion: "What our colleges really need is more of West Point." Unquestionably students respect a firm and impartial college *government.*

I only add, without arguing, the opinion, resting on the principles previously indicated, that a general religious control should be asserted—not sectarian, but Christian: daily attendance on chapel service, and attendance on some Sunday public service, according to the preference of the parent or guardian. It is

pleasant to see many recent indications that public sentiment is moving again in this direction.

S. C. BARTLETT,
President of Dartmouth College.

I ASSUME that we who are asked to discuss the question, "How far should a university control its students?" are expected to consider chiefly the management of collegiate students rather than of students in professional schools.

Like the similar question, "How far shall a father control his son between the ages of seventeen and twenty-one?" it is easy enough to give an answer in general terms, but not easy to give one in detailed and specific terms.

Probably all will agree that the college authorities should aim to do all in their power to bring the student through his college course with a vigorous body, a mind well-disciplined and stored with knowledge, and a pure, strong, and manly character. The control which is essential to the accomplishment of this result with the great body of students may be, and should be, exercised. But there are serious practical difficulties in applying this simple principle in the management of a college.

There is the very grave difficulty which arises from the difference in the ages of the students. Some of them are in years, and in physical, mental, and moral development, mere boys; others are mature men. It is not at all unusual to find students sixteen years old and those twenty-five or even thirty years old in the same class. Methods useful with the former are absurd with the latter. If we may borrow terms from the German schools to express our thought, we may say that we are embarrassed by having in the American colleges boys so young that gymnasial methods, both of intellectual and moral training, are suitable for them, and men old enough and sufficiently advanced in mental development to be trained under university methods. I think the average age of the students in the Western colleges and universities is somewhat higher than that in the Eastern institutions of similar grade. This may in part account for what I suppose to be a fact,—that rather more freedom is accorded to students in most of the larger Western colleges than in most of the Eastern. The average age of those admitted to the freshman class in the

University of Michigan for many years has ranged from nineteen to nineteen and a half years. The average age of the undergraduate here is about twenty-one. Of course, such a body of students can be treated differently from a body whose average age is nineteen. Still, as a few of our students are only sixteen, we are not free from the embarrassment named.

Another difficulty springs from the fact that with a large proportion of students the college life falls at the period when their passions and impulses are at their maximum strength, and when experience and reason have not taught them self-control in a large degree. Though not vicious, they may be thoughtless, and are often carried away in a whirl of temporary excitement to words and acts which they soon after condemn. What is wise treatment of young men in these moods is not always easy to say.

Again, the problem of college government is often made serious from the fact that too often students, from some cause, have regarded the relations of college teachers to them as antagonistic; have felt that it was their privilege, if not their right and duty, to outwit their guardians and cause them as much trouble as possible. This is an old college tradition, for the existence of which students are not alone responsible. It is in part due to unwise methods of government, more in vogue formerly than now, and especially to attempts to exercise excessive control of students. The tradition, however,—and hardly anything is more enduring and invincible than a college tradition,—still afflicts some colleges whose faculties no longer give provocation for this hostile attitude of their pupils.

To meet these and other difficulties, what means of control are commanded by the college authorities?

First, they can make and, so far as practicable, enforce rules and regulations to govern the conduct of students.

Secondly, they have the moral aid of the elevating and regulating power of the intellectual pursuits of their pupils, and also of such appeals as can be made to them when assembled.

Thirdly, the personal power of the teachers in their close intercourse with the students can be employed in removing the pestilent idea of official antagonism to them, and in elevating their aims and character.

Of these three instrumentalities for controlling students, the first should be used as little as possible, and the other two as

much as possible. Control by mere authority should be used as little as is compatible with the high ends sought in the conduct of a college. It must, indeed, be made plain to students, so that there is no shadow of a ground for misunderstanding on the point, that the faculty, and not the students, govern the college. But this being established, let the rules be as few and as simple as possible, and only such as can be reasonably well enforced. Let the hand of authority be displayed only when indispensably necessary. Punctuality in attendance and fidelity in work should be insisted on. If a fair degree of success in obtaining these is secured, the other details of the student's life may generally be left to him with safety. But he should be made to understand that a decent and manly life is expected of him always and everywhere. It is unwise and useless to confront him, in a pamphlet of college laws, with a long list of *mala prohibita*, which he is forbidden to commit. No college faculty has genius enough to name all the acts which ought to be forbidden. The wily student who is presented with the catalogue of forbidden sins is tempted to commit all which are not included in the list. But he knows what is decent and becoming and manly as well as the Professor of Moral Philosophy, and if informed that conduct which is manly will always be expected of him, he is much more likely to refrain from unbecoming acts than if held in subjection to a long code of petty rules and to a system of espionage.

The professors should not depend so much for the control of students on legislation as on getting near enough to their pupils to exert a positive moral influence upon them, on appeals to their manliness, on engendering in them the spirit of right-doing. Some teachers lack this power. But it should be coveted and sought after as one of the "best gifts" of a college officer. Members of the faculty should spare no personal efforts to induce students to abandon bad traditions and usages. They should strive to reach and control the younger students through the counsel and influence of the older. That is one of the most effective ways of controlling thoughtless, impulsive students. By all means the attempt should be constantly made to produce a public opinion in college in favor of manly conduct and in condemnation of all kinds of unmanly conduct, from mere childish tricks to disorder and vice.

Nor will a wise administration content itself with dealing with students as a mass. There should be most careful and considerate

treatment of individual cases. The number who are inclined to go wrong is usually small, unless in some special excitement which takes good men for the moment off their feet. That small number should be constantly looked after with the desire to make something of them if possible. Sometimes a professor who has special nearness of access to one of these men can do more for him than the executive officer of the college. But by sympathetic admonitions and appeals, by enlisting in the work older students, who are his friends, by all means at command, the effort should be made to save him to a career of industry and virtue if possible. If he cannot be saved, of course he must be made to withdraw ; but unless he has been guilty of some flagrant offence, there should be as little demonstration as possible about his withdrawal. There is room for great wisdom and tact in dealing with these individual cases, which form the centres of wrong-doing.

While, then, it should be distinctly understood as not open to debate that the faculty must govern the college, and must absolutely decide in any issue between them and the students, still the constant aim and unceasing study should be to make it unnecessary for them to use their authority by cultivating in all ways among the students the manly and earnest spirit which makes the resort to authority unnecessary, and especially by leading the students to feel that their teachers are not spies and antagonists, but their true friends, eager to assist them in every way. A great improvement has taken place in this generation in the relations of college officers and students, and in the general demeanor of students. That improvement has been largely due to the adoption to a greater or less extent of the principles advocated in this paper. In most colleges the petty and detailed supervision of the student's daily and hourly life has been relaxed or abandoned. Less reliance for insuring good conduct is now placed on manifold restraints than on the appeal to a manly spirit in the student. I am of the opinion that the introduction of the elective system in the latter part of the college course has also been most beneficial from a moral, as well as from an intellectual, point of view. The compulsory pursuit of unwelcome studies in the junior and senior years used to cause much friction and discontent.

But notwithstanding the gratifying improvement which this generation has seen in the management of colleges and in the

manners and life of undergraduates, this question of the amount and kind of control which should be exercised will continue to present difficulties so long as the college has to conduct both gymnasial and university work.

As to professional schools, when a part of universities, the same general principles as to work, attendance, and life are applicable as in the college, though, owing to the more advanced years of the students, certain obvious modifications in the application of these rules may be made. There is now a wholesome tendency to more rigorous demands on professional students than have been made in years past.

JAMES B. ANGELL,
President of the University of Michigan.

IN CONSIDERING the problem of discipline in our higher institutions of learning, it is well first to place clearly before our minds the immediate objects which such establishments should have in view. It is evident that these objects must go far to determine the system by which the conduct of youths who attend our colleges and universities is to be controlled. It is very clear that the essential aim of our higher educational establishments is to take youths who have received a considerable training in preparatory schools, who have attained the age of about eighteen years, and have begun to acquire the motives of men, and fit them for the higher walks of active life. To the youth must be given a share of learning which may serve to enlarge to the utmost his natural powers. He must be informed and disciplined in the art and habit of acquiring information. He must also be disciplined in the ways of men, in the maintenance of his moral status by the exercise of his will, in self-confidence, and in the faithful performance of duty for duty's sake. Every influence which tends to aid him in putting away the irresponsible nature of the child should be brought to bear; every condition which will lead him to send forth his expectations and ambitions from his place in the school to his place among men should surround him.

While all persons who have considered the problem of higher education will doubtless agree with the proposition that our university authorities should endeavor above all things to bring the youths under their care into the independent position of men, they doubtless perceive that there are very considerable difficulties in

the way of attaining this result. The most serious of these arises from the fact that in our larger colleges and universities a great number of young men, generally of imperfect family training, and often from preparatory schools where the influences are not calculated to develop discreet manly qualities, are crowded together under conditions which separate them from the influences which ordinarily control men. The surprise of the new position and the contagious effects of evil example on immature minds breed certain dangers which the authorities of these institutions have to meet by various methods of discipline. Control of some sort has to be exercised by the college authorities. The important question is as to the measure and nature of the influences which may be necessary to apply in order to secure a proper regulation of life on the part of young men.

The influences which may be brought to bear in order to secure good conduct on the part of students clearly fall into two classes. In one fear is the motive. The student may be forced to pursue a particular path by the knowledge that punishment awaits transgressions. The punishment may consist of deprivation of various privileges and exclusion from the institution, or in the chastisement which may be secured through the anxiety which his actions bring to his kindred and friends. There can be no question that fear is a powerful agent in controlling the conduct of men. A large part of our social machinery rests upon the fear as to the formal effects of misdoing. It is clear, however, that, while fear may often be valuable as a deterrent, it has not only no moral quality, but by its presence prevents the action of the moral motives. Fear is, unhappily, the necessary element of the laws which serve to hold society together, but all must acknowledge that the real good won by the advance either of the individual man or of society is gained in realms of action which lie quite without the control of this essentially base impulse. It is true that, when we limit the youth's action by anxiety lest his kindred should be distressed by his conduct, we bring into his mind something of a higher motive than purely selfish considerations. Still the element of fear remains, and with it comes the motive to conceal the evil which he has done. It is in this element of concealment, which fear induces, that we find the most debasing effects arising from any discipline which has formal punishments for sanctions. Where young men are

under the influence of a discipline that sets immediate personal penalties for offences, the temptation is to hide their evil doings from the authorities and to feel that, if they can secure secrecy, they escape the consequences of their acts. The more rigorous the discipline within the limits possible in a school of high grade, the more this furtive motive is developed. It is my conviction that the more successful the discipline of fear in controlling youths, the more completely it fails to accomplish an educative purpose.

Fortunately for the interests of education, there is another way of controlling the conduct of young men in our educational establishments. We may seek to affect their conduct, not to any extent through fear of immediate punishment, but by setting before them the nature of the great task which has brought them to the universities. Once bring a young man clearly to feel that his career in life is fairly begun when he resorts to college or the professional school ; let him but conceive that his place in life is to be determined by his conduct in preparation for it, and we bring to bear a set of motives which are morally as high as the ordinary motives of discipline are low in the moral scale. Just so far as the work of a student abounds in suggestions of his work in the world, so far as his teachers by their conduct, as well as by their words, serve to arouse his manly, dutiful sense, the education effects its true end. Every youth who is fitted to be a student in our higher colleges or universities will quickly respond to the stimulus he feels in passing from the disciplinary conditions of childhood to those which are fit for men. If he be in spirit capable of scholarly manliness, we may be sure that his imagination has forerun the conditions he has met in his lower schooling. He has longed for something like the independence and responsibility of manhood ; for an advance to the place of trust to which he is bidden. For my own part, I find that the quick response to the freedom which my own college gives to youths is an admirable touchstone of quality. Where a young man does not quickly and eagerly take up the burden of trust which is confided to him, I have little hope of his future. He may blunder a bit, but unless there is something which may be fairly called a passion for the man's duties, it seems to me he is unfitted for higher education. Such a youth best be placed at once in some well-controlled occupation, where he will not have to depend, as the scholar does, upon his own initiative, where he

may be supported in daily duty by the stimulants of necessity. Remember that few are called to the peculiar work for which the university trains men. The places it undertakes to fill are not suited to more than perhaps one in twenty of our young men. Some basis of selection must exist, and the surest I have been able to find is the capacity of the student to take himself in care.

Many circumstances serve to make our students ready for a more trust-bearing system of control. The ancient form of family discipline, where fear had a large place, where the son was wont to tremble at the wrath of the father, is passing, if, indeed, it has not quite passed, away. The old-fashioned stern control of a thoroughly-disciplined college, where the students were kept in subjection by the application of formalized rules of conduct, really represents the spirit of a family system which no longer exists. Nowhere else is the fundamental democracy of this country—a motive far stronger than is comprehended by the most of our publicists—so clearly marked as in the freedom of the American family. The relation between the American boy and his parents is generally one of perfect friendliness, in which the old control by fear has hardly any place. There are, it is true, those who lament the disappearance of discipline from our households; but such persons fail to comprehend the deeper currents of their time. The alteration in the form of family and academic discipline is a part of the vast democratic humanization which is changing the fundamental motives of our people. In preserving the ancient theory of relations between young men and those who are set over them, our colleges are maintaining an archaic system. Moreover, the students who now attend our higher colleges and universities are very much older than they were fifty years ago. It is hardly too much to say that the age of entering is not far from that at which students graduated when the common systems of discipline were framed. Furthermore, about all our higher colleges there have grown up professional schools and graduate departments, whose students are practically exempt from all the police control. These schools are commonly closely related to the academic department; the students are often housed together, and not infrequently share certain portions of the instruction, with the result that it is much more difficult to maintain a rigorous discipline in the college.

To change the system of discipline in our colleges from that which fits children to that which is suited to the conditions of men requires many important modifications in the conditions under which the students pursue their academic life. In the first place, it is necessary to have some approach to what is known as the elective system. The student must feel that he has to select, under advice, the studies which he is to pursue in order to fit himself for his career in the world. This repeated choice is, as a feature in education, worth more than any other instruction which he receives in the college, for the reason that it brings him at once into contact with the problems of life. Next, it is necessary to have a far larger proportion of instructors, and those of higher quality, than is necessary under the old disciplinary control. I am inclined to think that it is necessary to have for the best operation of this system about one instructor of satisfactory quality to each twelve students. The method of work must be such that the teachers come in very close contact with the students. The relation between officers and students must not be very remote, as under the unhuman system common of old, but one of man to man. Each student must be thoroughly well known by some member of the faculty, who feels in a way responsible for his conduct in life. When these relations are brought about, all mechanical systems of control tend at once to disappear.

So far this humanized method of control has been made the matter of most careful experiment in Harvard College. For many years the government of that institution has been tending towards this method of discipline. The steps which have led to the change in the method of control have been slowly accomplished in the course of thirty years. At first the advances towards the new system were resisted by the more conservative elements in the governing bodies, but each step forward has been attended by such evidence of gains in the scholarly and manly motives of the students that in the faculty at least—the body which comes in closest contact with the student life—there is now no one opposed to the innovation. No one doubts that the change has been in a high measure profitable both to the intellectual and moral quality of the youths. The young men are made ready for the work of the world in a simpler and more effective manner than under the old system.

It cannot be denied that there are certain, though limited, disadvantages connected with this change in the method of con-

trol. Wild youths, those affected by an excess of animal spirits, as well as those who are in a greater or less measure immoral, become more of a nuisance to their fellow-members of the university and the general public than of old. On the other hand, it is easier for the authorities to deal with these patent evils. Experience shows that the proportion of those who fail to meet their obligations is very small. A careful study of the young men in Harvard College during my career as a teacher, which now extends to a quarter of a century, has satisfied me that the percentage of those who go wrong under the system of freedom is very much less than under the old arbitrary, but ineffective, discipline. I am convinced, against my former prejudices, that we are on the right track, that our system is fitted to the time and state of our people, and that it promises to make youths ready for the service of society more quickly and certainly than the former method.

N. S. SHALER,
Harvard University.

THE question asked is one which seems, theoretically, to admit of an easy answer. And yet in practical university life there are not a few difficulties to be met. A boy should be directed and restrained; while to a man should be given the range of a large discretion. But the college student is often neither a boy nor a man; since, on the one hand, he refuses to be treated as a child, and, on the other, he finds it impossible to conduct himself like a human being that has passed the period of infancy. Reference is here made, of course, to that species of featherless biped which at times, especially when taken alone, seems to show many of the characteristics of rational intelligence, but which, when merged into a crowd of its fellows, is apt, on the least provocation, to part with its power of thought and lapse into all manner of irrational ways. What shall be done with such a creature is one of the practical problems that the college official has to meet.

It goes without saying that in every college community in which the atmosphere is fairly wholesome the great mass of students need no government whatever. If they know what the university requires of them, that is enough. But there are likely to be a few who refuse with more or less persistency to be included in this class. There is the lad who comes to the university with no very grave faults, but who is possessed with the notion that

the chief end of man is to have what he calls "a good time." He is not intemperate or immoral, according to the conventional usage of those words, but he has great energy of nature, and his pent-up enthusiasms crave that kind of excitement which comes from an energetic cane-rush or a good case of hazing. There is another who is not troubled with any craving for such laborious recreation, but is stubbornly indifferent to anything that comes in his way. He accepts whatever is offered with placid equanimity, and never either experiences enthusiasm or indulges in disgust. In short, he is what is called a good boy, and has no bad habits, except, possibly, that of not passing examinations. Then there is the class with positively vicious inclinations. These are they who frequent places of ill repute, and drag others in their train. They usually are endowed with certain elements of strength that enable them to stand up under a larger amount of dissipation than their fellows can carry. They are sometimes good scholars, and they often have the reputation of being what are called good fellows. They are apt to go straight to the bad; but sometimes they face about and become useful men. It is with such classes that the governing officer has to deal; for in the matter of discipline and government he has no occasion to think of the ninety-and-nine that need no repentance.

One of the first things to be insisted upon is the doctrine that every student will be regarded as an individual person and not as a member of a class. There is nothing more likely to fail than to attempt to deal with a class or a set as a whole. The most obdurate offender, when taken alone, can often be influenced by reason, but when he is arraigned in the presence of classmates, his pride is enlisted on the wrong side of the case, and the effect is almost certain to prove unsuccessful. Many a college officer has found to his sorrow that a class meeting is capable of infinite folly, and if the notion comes to prevail that a class can have any influence whatever in shaping faculty action, bad results will be almost certain to follow. It may be stated as a rule that the best elements of a class do not direct class action. The meetings very generally consist of what may be called the fermenting elements of the class. The most judicious men are quite apt to think it is as well to attend to their own business as to devote themselves to the business of others. They therefore temperately refrain from having too much to do with the ardent spirits of the class. And

so it often happens that a class meeting is a sort of juvenile caucus, without that shrewd regulating element which persistent experience is, in the end, sure to develop. Under this condition of class organization and custom it is not strange that the wrong thing is quite as likely to be recommended as the right thing. Hence it is not unwholesome to have the notion prevail in a college that a class meeting will injure any cause that it recommends. It is unwholesome to have the opinion prevalent that affairs are in the hands of the boys.

It may well be inferred that these views are not compatible with what may be called the democratic form of university government. There are probably few things more needed in America than a spirit of respectful obedience to recognized authority. It is as true as it is trite to say that a man is never fit to command till he knows how to obey. Our educated classes should not have this part of their education neglected. It is because this very important element of our education is not neglected in our Government schools that all over the world our military and naval officers are recognized and praised for those qualities which mark them unmistakably as belonging to a distinguished order of gentlemen.

Students as a class have no respect for hesitation or weakness: on the contrary, they have a real admiration and liking for power. Of course, power must rest upon reason and must be exercised with wisdom. If the student community is convinced that the authority of the faculty is generally wielded in a spirit of reasonableness, it will have far more respect for the source of that authority than it would have if the faculty were to show distrust of themselves by calling in the advice of those whom it is their business to guide and teach. If the assumption of superiority of the professor over the student in judgment as well as knowledge is to be abandoned, why is the student any longer to seek instruction?

Undoubtedly, authority must be exercised with great discretion. It is probably true that in general the colleges have far too many rules. There is nothing more unfortunate than the supposition on the part of students that anything is admissible provided it has not been specifically prohibited. Almost equally pernicious is the habit of nagging students for their small faults. Far more wholesome results may be obtained by the inculcation of general principles, leaving the application

of these principles to the judgment of students themselves, and then holding them responsible for the manner in which this trust is administered. Perhaps the most useful rule ever promulgated in an American school was that simple one which declared that every student was required at all times to conduct himself in a manner becoming a gentleman and a scholar, and that he would be held responsible for the observance of this standard. Such a requirement appeals to the approving reason of the student, and on the basis of it all needed discipline may readily be enforced. If students are duly made to feel that order is as much the first law of a university as it is the first law of heaven, they will have no difficulty in understanding that rushing and hazing will not be tolerated by any institution entitled to respect.

In a word, then, the requirements in regard to conduct should be few in number and should be of a character that will commend them to the approval of all reasonable minds. It should be understood from the first that college officials cannot expend their energies in playing the part of police officers. As soon as it is unmistakably apparent that any student is disposed persistently to defy or even to disregard the requirements of the institution, he should be promptly remanded to another field of usefulness. This is the course of wisdom: any other course is the course of weakness and folly.

CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS,
President of Cornell University.

TO WHAT extent should a university control its students? This is a complicated question. There are at least five departments of student life which may be subject to control: the intellectual; the religious; the moral; the physical; and deportment in and about college buildings. Then there are two kinds of control: official—by law and penalty; and personal—by advice and remonstrance. And, finally, the name university, as popularly used in a discussion like this, includes two distinct types of institutions: the centrally-located university, including professional schools and a post-graduate department; and the country college devoted wholly or chiefly to under-graduates. Hence our question includes five separate questions, each of which must be considered in two distinct relations; and all our conclusions will require

qualification according to the character of the institution to which they are applied.

First: intellectual control. The official control over the intellectual work of students should be strict and absolute. A requirement should be fixed and rigidly enforced. To allow a student to remain in a college when he is not doing a reasonable amount of work is a three-fold wrong. It is a wrong to the parent; for it is receiving his money under false pretences. It is a wrong to the student; for it confirms him in habits of indolence and irresponsibity. It is a wrong to the community; for it leads people to place that confidence which training and intelligence alone merit in those who have them not. The personal control over the intellectual life of students consists in restraining from excessive study the over-ambitious few; stimulating to greater effort the thoughtless many, who, though well above the official requirement, are yet far below the level of their own possible attainment; and giving advice concerning methods of work and choice of studies to all. There are two methods of enforcing this intellectual control. One insists upon absolute regularity of attendance. The other demands satisfactory results. Each method has its advantages and its disadvantages. The former cultivates regular habits, and is better adapted to younger students and to small colleges. The latter develops character through freedom, and is more harmonious with the university spirit.

Second: religious control. The extent to which official religious control is profitable depends upon the nature of the institution. In universities where a considerable proportion of the students are engaged in professional and post-graduate study, and in institutions supported by the state, attendance upon religious exercises may well be made voluntary. In colleges composed chiefly of under-graduates, supported by private benevolence, where, as is the case with nearly all our small colleges, Christian character and usefulness, quite as much as intellectual training and attainments, were the motive of their founders and benefactors, it is reasonable and right to require attendance at daily prayers in the college chapel and at public worship upon the Sabbath. The personal control of the religious life of students should be gained by friendly council and conference on religious topics; by pointing out the religious bearings of college work and college life; and by

the force of Christian character and example. The fact that the convictions and ideals which are to mould character and determine conduct are being formed by scores and perhaps hundreds of their students renders this one of the most important and responsible relations of every college professor for whom religious truth and duty have a serious significance.

Third: moral control. The college should enforce outward conformity with the recognized rules and requirements of morality and the standards of gentlemanly behavior. It should repress and punish overt acts which reflect discredit upon the college, and expel students guilty of flagrant and notorious immorality. The president and professors should maintain also a watchful interest in the morals of the students, and by personal efforts, and by communication with parents and friends, should throw around each student the support and sympathy in doing right, the reproof and remonstrance for doing wrong, which he has been accustomed to receive at home, and which he might expect to receive anywhere from friends interested in his welfare.

Fourth: physical control. The extent to which physical control can be carried profitably depends upon the extent to which formal requirements are carried in other departments. Where attendance at prayers and recitations is largely voluntary, and where studies are elective, required physical exercise would be incongruous. Yet where definite requirements as to time, place, and method are made in other departments, it is proper to require a thorough physical examination and regular prescribed physical exercise of every student. The college authorities should exclude from severe athletic contests all who, from constitutional defects or from inadequate training, cannot engage in them with perfect safety; and should limit games and contests to such times and places as will not interfere seriously with study.

Fifth: deportment in and about the college buildings. The college should aim to secure such order and quiet as are necessary for successful study. This should be done in such a manner as to leave the students as free as possible from interference and inspection. In the smaller colleges this control may be delegated to a representative body of students. Such a body will tolerate in minor matters some things which the faculty would not approve; yet, on the other hand, they can ascertain and punish much more precisely and effectively such offences as are clearly

detrimental to the general welfare. And any lack of rigor that may result from such a system is more than counterbalanced by the greater self-control and self-respect it develops in the students, and the more sympathetic and confidential relation it renders possible between students and faculty. And where this spirit of self-control is developed, and this friendly relation between students and professors is maintained, the general overthrow of foolish customs, handed down from earlier days, when students were mere schoolboys and the faculty was regarded as their natural enemy, will be only a question of time.

Such being, in brief outline, the chief lines of legitimate control of the university over its students, what results may we look for? If we expect students in all cases to be as eager in the pursuit of learning as members on the floor of the Stock Exchange are in quest of gain; if we expect them always and everywhere to be as sedate and solemn in their demeanor as deacons at a religious meeting; if we expect them in all relations to be as considerate of each other's feelings as polite people at a party; if we expect them to be as discreet and judicious in all they do and say as Senators engaged in a serious deliberation,—of course we shall be disappointed, and captious critics will find abundant opportunity to make merry over the short-comings of college authorities and the misdoings of college boys. If, however, along with some false ambition and more shirking indifference, we secure a fair amount of mental growth and intellectual attainment from nine-tenths of every class; if, with a good deal of healthy protestantism toward traditional dogmas and some conceited contempt for spiritual realities, we develop in the majority a reasonable and reverent regard for religious truth and duty; if, with deliberate vice in a few and more or less thoughtless folly in many, we cultivate in nearly all an honest and earnest purpose to do right and a willingness to sacrifice private interests to noble and generous aims; if, with an occasional physical break-down from too little exercise and an occasional mental failure from too much sport, we send out the great mass of graduates with sound minds in sound bodies; if, with now and then a spontaneous outbreak of general disorder and with habitual neglect of opportunities on the part of individuals here and there, the average student is kept profitably employed throughout the year,—the college and university accomplish as much with the youth committed to their charge as faithful

parents succeed in doing with their own sons and daughters of the same age, and as much as a thoughtful public reasonably can expect.

WILLIAM DEWITT HYDE,
President of Bowdoin College.

ANY title that the writer may have to be regarded as an authority on this important question arises from the fact that for thirty-three years he has been at the head of a growing university, which has risen in that time from little more than fifty to nearly six hundred students, and in which there has been no instance of any college rebellion or serious disturbance. For this exemption, however, I do not take credit to myself. The McGill University has had an able and devoted governing board, a body of competent, diligent, and popular professors, derived from a large number of different universities on both sides of the Atlantic; and the Canadian student is, on the whole, a hard worker, and not too self-asserting. In these circumstances, my experience may not have been exactly the same with that of some other college officers.

The question, How far should a university control its students? seems to imply that some control should be exercised. It would seem at the present day that this should scarcely be taken for granted. When it is the custom to govern nations by the votes of the plebs, however uneducated and incompetent, why should not the students control their professors, and dictate what they should be taught and how they should learn, or at least what restraints, if any, should be imposed on them. Independently of this, we are, by would-be reformers, referred even to the ancient mediæval customs which, in the origin of university life, made the community of students that which constituted the university, simply by resorting to some popular teacher for instruction. But in those days both professor and student were supposed to be under the control of mother church, which regulated all their doings and left little scope for private judgment of any kind. To some extent this ecclesiastical control still exists in certain denominational colleges, but in these it is a fertile source of disturbance, owing to the friction between the counter-currents of modern and ancient ideas, which, by their movement in opposite directions tend to produce whirlwinds or tornadoes of

opinion and action. It is to be observed, however, that even under the most democratic forms of government, when the community collectively, or a majority of it, elects its magistrates, the individual members become bound to obey, under such laws as may be in force.

Farther, the student is not a finished character, or a person in a fixed or stationary condition; he is in a state of pupilage, and of active mental and moral growth and development, not having yet reached, though tending toward, an ultimate position of independence. It follows from this that the individual growth of the student is an important factor in the case—perhaps the important factor—and that the influence exerted on him is not like that of chiselling a block of marble or hammering a bar of iron, but like that of regulating the growth of a young tree or of determining the course of a running stream. The educator is thus not a mere workman, but a trainer of an organism vastly complicated in structure and relations, and in a constant state of growth and development and of accommodation to its environment. This consideration unquestionably greatly complicates the question of control, since very slight influences acting on vital tissues may produce the most far-reaching effects; and no control should be of such a nature as to interfere with due vitality and symmetrical development.

Under these limitations, then, it may be assumed that some control or guidance must be exercised by the instructor, and that it may differ in kind as well as in degree, and may refer to individual moral character and conduct, to social relations, to educational work, and, in connection with this, to the relations of students with one another and with their teachers as part of an educational community, in which, as in all communities, some sacrifice of individual liberty must be made in the interest of the great ends to be secured by the association. In the case in question these ends are of the highest order, and it can scarcely be assumed that the individual student is in a position to judge independently as to these ends and the means of their attainment, or that even the collective wisdom of the students will be adequate to this, previous to any experience on their part of the course they are to follow. These considerations may be summed up under the short statement that any one travelling on a road unknown to him by

experience will be the better for the guidance of some one who has gone the same way previously.

Keeping these general statements in view, it will simplify matters to ask the question with reference to institutions purely educational and not under ecclesiastical control, and with reference to institutions for general education rather than that which is special or professional. If I confine myself to my own experience, the further limitation will be imposed that McGill does not provide residences for its students, and it is well known that the inmates of college boarding-houses have a somewhat special relation to the university, as distinguished from those who lodge in private houses and simply attend lectures.

With these limitations I may further explain that in McGill University each faculty exercises jurisdiction over its own students, the executive officer being the dean of the faculty. The principal intervenes only when desired to give advice or assistance, or when any case arises affecting students of different faculties; and the power of expelling students resides only in the corporation—a body including the governors, the principal, and all the deans of the faculties, with elective representatives of the faculties, of the affiliated colleges, and of the graduates.

Under this system it is understood that each professor is supreme in his own class-room, but his power of discipline is limited to a temporary suspension from lectures, which must be at once reported to the dean. If necessary, the dean may lay the case before the faculty, which, after hearing, may reprimand, report to parents or guardians, impose fines, suspend from classes, or, in extreme cases, report to the corporation for expulsion. No case involving this last penalty has, however, yet occurred, and the effort in all cases is to settle every case of discipline by personal influence and with as little reference to laws and penalties as possible.

With this machinery a simple code of rules is sufficient. It provides for orderly and moral conduct in the buildings and in going and coming, and for the safety of the property of the university, and prohibits all action likely to obstruct the work of the college or to interfere with the progress of other students. In the case of college societies it is required merely that their objects shall be consistent with those of the university, and that their laws and officers shall be communicated to and approved by the faculty in whose rooms they meet.

Above and beyond all such machinery and rules lies the obligation on principal, deans, and professors to watch the beginnings of evil and to counteract by wise and kindly advice anything that may lead to disorder. On the one hand, the effort should be to allow all that liberty which tends to make students self-reliant and fit for the battle of life, and, on the other, to prevent the formation of any habits of life inimical to the interests of their fellow-students or injurious to themselves.

I believe this constant kindly watchfulness, without anything of the nature of espionage, and observing the distinction between trifles that, however annoying for the moment, lead to nothing and those breaches of discipline that may have important consequences, constitutes the best safeguard for order, while the cultivation of interest and enthusiasm for college work at once secures progress and peace. In short, the control of young men or young women is to be exercised rather in the way of inducing them to like their work and duty than by any influence of the nature of coercion or restraint. In this way only can they be trained to control themselves and, when their turn comes, to control others. They who would rule must themselves learn willing obedience. Of course, there is place here for all the elevating influence of spiritual religion, and there is scope for that most important power which arises from the example of punctuality, self-denial, and honest work on the part of professors.

In connection with this it may be proper to remark that the most serious difficulties met with by college administrators often arise not directly from the students, but from the action of instructors and other officers. When these are careless, incompetent, irritable, or exacting, difficulties are certain to occur, and are not lessened by the necessity to sustain, at least for the time, legitimate authority, in the face of objections which may be in many respects reasonable.

Equally serious difficulties may occur from the imprudence or mischievous disposition of persons to whom students naturally look up, when such persons criticise before them the conduct of instructors or administrators, or cultivate discontent with the regulations which may be in force. Agitations excited in this way are very detrimental to the individual student and to college work in general, while they impose an additional burden of vigilance and self-denial on officers, perhaps already overworked, in

the effort, while meeting all reasonable demands, to avert revolutions which might have disastrous effects in the little world of college life.

Lastly, it should be taken for granted that very few students are radically evil-disposed, and that even these are amenable to higher influences, though there are, no doubt, cases in which it is better that a few corruptors of good should be sacrificed for the benefit of the majority. The instructor or administrator must bear in mind that he also serves a Master, and is in some sense the servant of all, and that "the Lord's servant must not strive, but be gentle toward all, apt to teach, forbearing, in meekness correcting those that oppose themselves." If by God's grace he can serve in this manner, the question of control is not likely to arise in any very acute form.

J. WILLIAM DAWSON,
Principal and Vice-Chancellor of McGill University.

THE control exercised over students may be of three kinds—over their choice of studies, over their attendance and preparation at college exercises, or over their general conduct. The conditions of universities, so-called, are so different that it will be better to give simply our general experience in the academic department of the University of California, and my deductions from that.

The entire university numbers 616 students, of whom 253 are in the professional schools located in San Francisco. The undergraduate department, of which I propose to speak particularly, is located at Berkeley, ten miles from San Francisco and five miles from Oakland, a city of 60,000 people. It numbers on its rolls 363 students (291 men and 72 women), the average age of entrance for all students being about nineteen years, the minimum being sixteen years. We have no dormitories, and after five o'clock in the afternoon our students are scattered to their homes and the campus is deserted, nearly one-half living in Oakland and San Francisco.

It is evident at once that some of these particulars simplify very much the problem of controlling the general conduct of the students. The presence of 20 per cent. of women and the scattering of the students after dark lessen very much the diffi-

culty of preserving order. Then the absence of any display of wealth among our students tends to general moderation and sobriety. Add to this systematic gymnasium training and an ample opportunity for field exercises, both of which form excellent safety-valves for superfluous animal spirits, and it will be seen why, without much control of general conduct, our students for the most part preserve excellent order.

In the matter of the choice of studies, our practice differs somewhat from most of the older colleges. We neither bind the student to the old-fashioned iron-clad curriculum, nor do we give him absolute freedom of choice in all respects. Our studies are arranged in eight grooves or courses, each leading to a definite form of education, each complete in itself. Of these eight courses five are scientific and three are literary. The scientific courses are in agriculture, mechanics, civil-engineering, mining, and chemistry. The literary courses are, first, in Greek and Latin; second, in Latin and English; third, in English literature and modern history and languages.

There are electives in all the courses, more in the later college years than in the earlier ones. There is a difference in the proportion of prescribed studies in the different courses also, the scientific courses having less election. Of course, where the studies lead to a definite end, like agriculture or mining, the choice of studies must be more limited. In point of difficulty the courses are intended to be as nearly equivalent to one another as possible, though, after all, some are much harder than others. Students desiring to pursue special courses may do so, if of mature years, by vote of the faculty. But in all cases, regular or special, the student must present a card showing a consistent and profitable course of study ranging through the years he expects to remain at the university, and this card must be approved by the faculty.

This dividing the studies into grooves, and requiring the student to select his groove, have been approved by experience, and the large body of students choose the regular courses. The advantage lies in this: The student at sixteen is unable to lay out his course of study, and even those of more mature years would be confused by the multiplicity of the studies and the conflict of the hours of recitation. But under our system he is only called on to choose his general pursuit, and then he finds the

details laid out and the schedule of hours already arranged. If he is still desirous of deviating from the approved schedule, he may lay his plan of study before the faculty, who will generally accept it if it is thorough and consistent.

I believe, then, in the exercise of control over the student's choice of studies to the extent which we practice here. It is a golden mean between the old-fashioned rigid curriculum, and the other extreme where all is elective—a plan which calls on the students to shape their four years of study to a time when a considerable proportion of them are of immature years and unfit to make the choice; imposing upon them, moreover, the difficulties of reconciling the conflicting hours of different studies upon the schedule. And it prevents the lazy student from making up a course of "soft things" whereby he may pass through the four years of college life without any hard study.

In the matter of attendance and preparation at college exercises there is a wide difference of practice at various universities. I believe that, as our American colleges are constituted, the requirements should be quite strict. Many students come to college at the minimum age of sixteen, and, being fresh from the strict discipline of the high-school, too much liberty works to their harm. Some steady pressure is required to keep them up to their work; else they fall into habits of idleness and negligence. Then, too, many even of the older students are without any true thirst for learning. They entered college to please their parents, or to get the degree, or simply because it was the fashion, and they followed the example of their schoolmates. They have no real love of learning, nor do they feel the pressure of want—the need of an education to win a position in after life. There are many such, and they require some spur outside of themselves to keep them up to their work.

I would not advocate for such students the rigid system needed for young boys in the high-school or academy, but some control is required to maintain proper attendance and preparation. Regular attendance in the class-room is necessary, for, whether the instruction be by recitation or lecture, what transpires in the class-room is an important addition to the text-book, and should be listened to by the student. Moreover, in ascertaining whether the student is profiting by his college work, the examination at the end of the term is at best a poor way of finding out. The

daily recitation is a better test of the progress the student is making, and even when instruction is by lectures solely, mid-term or monthly off-hand examinations are more efficient. Cramming for a final examination, even if successful, is a poor substitute for daily term work.

Perhaps the same supervision is not required over the advanced classes, for by the time they reach that period the idlers have been largely weeded out, and the students who remain are older and have more sense of responsibility; but certainly our experience tells us that the younger classes require constant supervision. Another important reason is that the presence in a class of a considerable proportion of idlers drags down the standard of all the work and keeps back those who are competent and ambitious to press forward and do better.

To sum it all up: my observation and experience lead me to believe that in the under-graduate department of any college a careful control should be exercised over the student's choice of studies, and after that a steady supervision of his attendance and preparation of the college exercises, more especially during the early years of his course.

I have not spoken of the students engaged in post-graduate studies and professional schools (although they form a part of every true university), because they are more mature and usually undertake those studies as a preparation for their life-work. Their courses are marked out for them definitely, and very little control is generally exercised over their conduct or attendance.

In this paper I have spoken only of those parts of the university system with which I have come most in contact and where I have had most experience.

HORACE DAVIS,
President of the University of California.

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF THE CIVIL WAR.

II.

BY GENERAL VISCOUNT WOLSELEY, K. P., ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF THE BRITISH ARMY.

THE second volume of the "Battles and Leaders" is, in my judgment, even more interesting than the first volume. It introduces us to the period when General McClellan transformed the armed masses which had fought at the first battle of Bull Run, together with the vast numbers of recruits who subsequently joined them, into the Army of the Potomac. It takes us through the Peninsular Campaign and dwells upon the deeply-interesting questions involved in its conduct, as well as in its conception as illustrated by later events. It tells us of those two brilliant champions of a lost cause whose leadership is full of military suggestion and military lessons. No matter how doubtful at every point and for all time may have been the legality or advisability of the War, that two such men had fought on any one side would, of itself, throw a halo round the cause they fought for. Their character can never fail to excite general admiration. Even those who were most bitterly opposed to Stonewall Jackson and to Robert Lee, even those who believed them to be utterly wrong in their conception of national duty, will readily admit their excellence as soldiers, their sincerity as patriots.

There is so much to be said on the campaigns in the Shenandoah Valley, on the seven days' fighting near Richmond, on the campaign against Pope, and on Lee's invasion of Maryland, that I must pass over somewhat lightly the most important operations of Admiral Farragut, which led to the capture of New Orleans. Nevertheless, for us of the old country these "amphibious" operations, as Mr. Kinglake would call them, have a quite peculiar importance. The coöperation of the United States navy

with their army, in producing a decisive effect upon the whole character of the military operations, is akin to what happens with us in nearly every war in which we engage. A German, a French, or a Russian general may frequently, perhaps usually, carry on a campaign without considering what assistance he may expect to derive from the coöperation of his own navy, or what impediments he may expect to encounter from the operations of the naval forces of his enemy. An English general has almost always to make his calculations strictly in accordance with what the navy can do for him. The operations by which the Federal navy, in conjunction with the army, split the Confederacy in two and severed the East from the West, must always, therefore, have for him a profound interest and importance. The great strategical results obtained by this concentration of military and naval power, which were as remarkable as the circumstances under which the successes were gained, deserve our closest study.

I shall not attempt to discuss from a naval point of view the much-debated question whether Admiral Porter's mortar-schooners were or were not largely instrumental in determining the success of Farragut's passage between Fort Jackson and Fort St. Philip. The point is, however, one in which the effect on the forts is as much involved as the action of the navy. I may, therefore, venture the opinion, based on the evidence of the Confederate side, that the bombardment, considering the enormous number of large shells actually exploded within Fort Jackson, had comparatively little effect in preventing that fort from contributing its share toward the result of the operation. Captain Robertson's evidence (p. 100, Vol. II.) is distinct that at the time of Admiral Farragut's passage, in the water-battery at least, "every gun in the battery was loaded and pointed toward the river, and the men were kept at their posts"; and again: "No guns were silenced in either Fort Jackson or the water-battery at any time during this engagement. Not a man was driven from his post at the guns in the water-battery, much less from the battery itself."

It is, *mutatis mutandis*, almost the same story that General Sheridan tells of the effect of the Prussian artillery at Gravelotte. There the Prussian officers believed they had absolutely silenced the French artillery and crushed out the resistance of the French infantry. From his experience during the Civil War, General Sheridan told them that when they made their attack they would

find out their mistake. One of the most bloody repulses sustained by the Germans throughout the war soon afterwards verified the correctness of his inference.

Had it been necessary to silence by mortar fire the guns of Fort Jackson and the water-battery before the ships ran the gauntlet between Fort Jackson and Fort St. Philip, Farragut would never have achieved his splendid success. No! as always in war, Farragut's success was almost purely the result of the moral effect which his movement produced, and of defects other than material in the force opposed to him. It is clear that there was a complete want of unity of command over the combined naval and military defences for the protection of New Orleans. No doubt the Southern fleet was not properly ready for action, and for this unreadiness it would seem that Captain Mitchell, who commanded it, was not responsible. I do not think, however, it is possible to read the correspondence which passed between Captain Mitchell and General Duncan without feeling that Captain Mitchell was one of those men, common enough in every service, who cannot bring themselves to imagine that any one outside their own particular calling is other than a stupid fool. Such men usually conceive it to be their first duty to ignore, as an impertinent interference, any suggestion which comes from outside their own charmed circle. It is clear that the officers in the forts were in a position to observe the movements and to forecast the intentions of the Federals, and that the officers in the ships were not. As it turned out, the "Louisiana" proved absolutely useless to the defence. General Duncan saw through the intentions of Admiral Farragut, but his correct anticipation that the attempt would be made the night it was actually made was an absurd landsman's guess about matters he was not calculated to express any useful opinion upon. His views were, therefore, contemptuously ignored.

Had Captain Mitchell been a man large-minded enough to rise above paltry professional prejudices, he would not have continued to expend all his energies on preparing the "Louisiana" for a service she was never called upon to perform. But he would, on the other hand, have kept "the river well lit up with fire-rafts," as he was again and again urged to do. The temper shown in this proceeding is one so dangerous that, whenever it appears, it deserves to be castigated by those who review the facts afterwards,

whether the lash falls on naval or military shoulders. The same temper, it would seem, crops out in Commodore Mitchell's present defence. "Naval officers," he says, "ought surely to be considered better judges of how the forces and appliances at their command should be managed than army officers." Certainly no one will dispute that statement, but both naval and army officers must be judged by a reasonable examination of the results of their action and of the alternatives open to them. On the question whether certain naval officers properly coöperated with and paid proper attention to the representations of the soldiers, a Naval Court of Inquiry is not likely to be the most impartial of tribunals. It would have been interesting if, in appealing to the final judgment of history, Commodore Mitchell had not relied merely upon a naval verdict, which, as he admits, was given without any reception of the evidence on the other side. It would have been well for him to explain why no fire-ships were sent down the river; why the forts were left to fight in the dark during the actual night of attack. Granting that he is correct in urging that by the evening of the 24th April he would have had his ships ready, it would be interesting to know what service he considered he was rendering the Confederacy by preparations which, it was pointed out to him, could not be completed in time for the attack that others believed would be made on the night it actually occurred. To weigh fairly the evidence and to estimate justly the soundness or unsoundness of the reasons and motives which determined Commodore Mitchell's action at the time, it is not necessary to be either a soldier or a sailor. When that officer alleged that he did not take steps to meet the attack on the night between April 23 and 24, because the "Louisiana" would be ready for service by the evening of the 24th, any man of ordinary common-sense will understand that he disbelieved the evidence supplied to him. The evidence went to show that the attack would be made twenty-four hours before the evening of the 24th. Yet surely those reasons for expecting the attack to be made when it did actually come off were absolutely sound.

Such, I think, will be the verdict of independent naval officers, who examine the facts without prejudice. I would sooner have exposed such a line of conduct on the part of a soldier, because my views upon it would then have been more manifestly impartial. But I feel it is important, in the interest of all naval

and military states, that these miserable little professional prejudices should be exposed wherever and whenever they occur, for the encouragement of the large-minded men of both services. To do so frankly at all times will, I think, check one of the most fatal tendencies by which the success of any joint naval and military operations may be imperilled, as, in my opinion, the interests of the Confederacy were seriously injured in this instance. To me it seems clear that Admiral Farragut's splendid achievement was made possible, first, by the inadequate previous preparation of the naval part of the New Orleans defences ; secondly, by the want of harmonious working between the Confederate naval and military forces ; and, lastly, by his own clear appreciation of the moral effect he would produce by forcing his way past the defences of Fort Jackson and Fort St. Philip and by his appearance before New Orleans. For, after all, the forts were never captured by actual attack. They fell because the Confederate soldiers in Fort Jackson mutinied against the continuance of the defence when New Orleans had been captured. It is a curious fact to note that, at that very time, New Orleans—which, however, could not itself be defended—was surrendering avowedly because those forts had fallen ! This brilliant result is a striking instance of the due appreciation by a commander of the effect which daring achievements exert on men's minds, although, as in this case, those daring acts do not actually, directly, or materially make certain the end or the surrender they may have secured. In other words, Admiral Farragut's attack was based on a knowledge of the superior importance in war of moral over material force. One can hardly offer a higher compliment to any naval or military commander.

I pass now to the appointment of General McClellan to the command of the Army of the Potomac, and his subsequent accession, for a time at least, to the general command of the armies of the United States. I entertain the strongest possible belief, which has been confirmed by all the evidence supplied by the *Century* papers, that for the failure of the Peninsular Campaign the Administration at Washington was far more to blame than General McClellan. It is, therefore, only fair that I should turn first to the defence of the Administration which has been attempted by Lieutenant-Colonel R. B. Irwin (p. 435, Vol. II.), and examine it in the light of the evidence supplied elsewhere.

General McClellan was appointed on July 25, 1861, to the command of the army in the department of the Potomac, and on November 1 following "to command the whole army" of the United States. He had to create out of purely raw materials an army of which the part he proposed to employ in the Peninsula alone was 156,000 strong. The more one studies the nature of this force as it manœuvred and fought in the Peninsula, and as, despite all its subsequent disasters, it substantially remained throughout the War, the more marvellous does the ability, as well as the rapidity, with which General McClellan organized it appear to soldiers who understand the magnitude and difficulty of the task he undertook. Throughout his whole army, with few exceptions, this appears to have been the view taken by all, from the most senior general to the youngest recruit. But outside the army this was different, although in newspaper articles he was commonly referred to, with more effusion than sense, as the young American Napoleon. They did not hesitate to puff this untried leader as they would have advertised the talents of some rising dentist. As time wore on without bringing any decisive action, there arose throughout the mass of the people an impatience at the delay of preparation, which became daily more apparent. That most cruel tyrant, the "public," had no means of realizing the difficulties to be overcome. It did not understand what organization meant, but it shared with all peoples the very common article of faith that you have only to gather together hundreds of thousands of men, and to arm them, in order to form an army.

As the months of 1862 went by, the universal feeling was one of impatience and restlessness at what was deemed the waste of time and the useless delay which were taking place. Under that impression, and under the force which this so formed Public Opinion was exerting, the Administration at Washington found itself compelled to act. That is evident enough from the most interesting and striking letters which Colonel Irwin quotes as written by Mr. Lincoln to McClellan. It is clear in all of them that the President felt he was being driven by a power superior to his own, and by one to which McClellan, like himself, must yield. "Once more let us tell you," he writes, "it is indispensable to *you* that you strike a blow! I am powerless to help this." The Administration was merely giving expression to the decrees of an

entirely ignorant public opinion. If all those who wield the pen would only kindly wait until commanders have quite accomplished the mission entrusted to them before they decide that soldiers, "with their guns and drums and fuss and fury," are to pass away and leave the glory to others, it might matter little to the state. But when in the middle of a war they take it upon themselves to drive or to force those whom they influence to decide what the naval or military commander should do, the result will certainly be, as it was in this instance, to protract, perhaps for years, the duration of the war which they, in their self-conceit, imagined they could settle off-hand at once.

If these *Century* articles could be as widely read among us as they have been in America, we might possibly be saved in the future from disasters such as were entailed on us in the Crimea by very similar action. In particular, I should like those articles by Mr. Warren Lee Goss, the "Recollections of a Private," duly studied. For, after all, questions of strategy, of tactics, and of the importance of organization of all kinds turn upon the effect which is ultimately produced on the spirit and well-being and fighting efficiency of the private soldier. Whilst the organs of public opinion and their humble servant, the public Administration, were grumbling at the slow movements which only carried General McClellan's army forward fifty-two miles in sixteen days (Colonel Irwin, p. 437), Private Lee Goss and his companions were learning "in time that marching on paper and the actual march made two very different impressions," and though they could "easily understand and excuse our fireside heroes, who fought their own or our battles at home over comfortable breakfast-tables, without impediments of any kind to circumscribe their fancied operations," they found out also that it is "much easier to manœuvre and fight large armies around the corner grocery than to fight, march, and manœuvre in wind and rain, in the face of a brave and vigilant enemy."

There are, however, matters beyond the immediate view of the private which must be considered. From the moment when, thanks to those mistakes of Mr. Jefferson Davis of which I spoke in the last article, the Federal navy had asserted its absolute supremacy at sea, it is clear that the shortest and safest, as well as the most decisive, route to Richmond was by a movement based on the James River. To carry this out arrangements for the ade-

quate protection of Washington were essential. But whilst McClellan with the main army marched upon Richmond, it was necessary to protect the force allotted for the defence of Washington from a counter-stroke by Lee or by his lieutenant, Stonewall Jackson. To effect this it was desirable to keep it close to Washington, and thus as far away from Richmond as was possible with due regard to the safety of the former city. In order that the army on the James River, intended for offensive operations, should be made as strong as possible, the force detailed for the protection of Washington should have been as small as was consistent with the accomplishment of its object, and should have had a strictly defensive rôle allotted to it. This concentration of energy on a single aim at a time is such a commonplace of ordinary business life that it is passing strange why it should be so difficult to persuade men who have not had the experience of war that in all military operations it is the one thing most needful. Military history, had it been known to Mr. Lincoln and his ministers, would have taught them that, under the then existing circumstances, the Confederate army could not venture far away from Richmond. That threatened capital was not only the seat of the Confederate government, but it was also the base from which the Confederate armies between Richmond and Washington drew their supplies. Whenever attacked, those armies must have returned to defend it.

I think General McClellan ought not to have left Washington without convincing himself that Mr. Lincoln and the Secretary of War were satisfied with the arrrangements he had made for the defence of the capital. That those arrangements were in themselves adequate is beyond doubt. In omitting to come to this understanding with the President, he evinced, it would seem, a want of knowledge of the working of popular governments in times of great national danger. He thus exposed himself to, or, at least, he gave an excuse for, the very thing which happened—that which ruined his chances in the campaign; namely, the withdrawal from his command of at least 63,000 men. Nor was this mere withdrawal of McDowell's corps, of Blenker's division, and of the 10,000 men of General Wool's command, the only disastrous consequence which was entailed on McClellan by the exaggerated fears of the Government at Washington. Secretary Stanton appears to have been encouraged by this first interference

with McClellan's plans to take upon himself the general direction of the whole campaign. It was he who thrust forward the force under McDowell, and so entailed upon McClellan the necessity of placing himself in that false position astride of the Chickahominy which led to all the misfortunes of this campaign. It is scarcely possible to imagine any military arrangements more futile than those which were devised by this civilian Minister of War, Mr. Stanton. His scattering of the Federal forces throughout the Shenandoah Valley gave Jackson the opportunity for carrying out his brilliant campaign in that region. The necessity of maintaining connection with the armies which were to come to his support from the North obliged McClellan so to divide his force that, had General J. E. Johnston's orders been properly carried out, the Federal army ought to have had its left wing annihilated at the battle of Seven Pines, as it actually had its right wing crushed at Gaines's Mill.

As already stated, I think General McClellan should have satisfied Mr. Lincoln as to the steps he had taken for the defence of Washington, because that was a subject on which the President had fairly every right to be satisfied; but I cannot admit that this omission on the General's part was any adequate excuse for the complete upsetting of his whole plan of campaign. Mr. Lincoln, though doubtless one of the greatest men who have ruled the United States, was entirely ignorant of war. Able and wise as he was in all matters of civil government, he failed here most disastrously. By the course he pursued he wrecked an ably-devised plan for the advance upon Richmond of all the available Federal forces by one single line, whilst the troops intended for the defence of Washington were kept as passive as possible. Instead of that plan, a divided command was inaugurated and a disjointed series of movements were ordered, which ended in the transfer of the initiative to Lee. The change ordered by Mr. Lincoln in McClellan's plans gave the Confederates an opportunity for throwing their united forces, at pleasure, upon any part of the scattered Federal army. I cannot admit, as Colonel Irwin appears to expect we should all at once do, that McClellan was wrong in refusing to explain publicly to the Cabinet the details of his proposed scheme. At that time it was notorious that what was said to the Cabinet in Washington leaked out at once into the streets, and was thence conveyed promptly to the Confederate authorities. I know, from

what I learned at Richmond in the autumn of 1862, how well Lee was kept informed of everything done or intended by the Northern army.

Let us hear Stonewall Jackson on this subject, and compare his methods and principles of action in each particular with those that were pressed on McClellan by the Washington Administration, or, rather, by their master, public opinion. We have to thank General Imboden for those golden sentences of Jackson's which comprise some of the most essential of all the principles of war :

"Always mystify, mislead, and surprise the enemy, if possible ; and when you strike and overcome him, never let up in the pursuit so long as your men have strength to follow ; for an army routed, if hotly pursued, becomes panic-stricken, and can then be destroyed by half their number. The other rule is, never fight against heavy odds, if by any possible manœuvring you can hurl your own force on only a part, and that the weakest part, of your enemy and crush it. Such tactics will win every time, and a small army may thus destroy a large one in detail, and repeated victory will make it invincible."

Compare those principles, and the mode in which Jackson carried them out, with the ideas current at Washington, and you will see that they are direct inversions. The orders which emanated from there may be described thus :

"Go straight at the enemy at the very point where he expects you, and where he has long been expecting to receive you. Let every one know what you are going to do, so that we may announce it in the public press, and chuckle and crow over your coming victory. Scatter your forces in as many directions as possible, so that the enemy may always be able to bring superior forces against you. Arrange your force so that it is rigidly tied to one particular point, and that the enemy cannot doubt where you will be. Go ahead without preparation, forethought, or care; only let us hear that you are moving, so that the newspapers may brag."

These—I declare I have nothing exaggerated and naught set down in malice—these are the principles and practice which Colonel Irwin has undertaken the task of defending. It is a difficult one. I frankly admit that, when dealing with this fatuous folly, General McClellan did not behave with the meekness of an amiable schoolboy under discipline. I think he was unjust to Mr. Stanton in supposing that he (Mr. Stanton) had any personal hostility to him. Mr. Stanton really believed that the orders he gave were transparently sound and wise, and that any one who differed from him must be wrong. I do not know, however, that, placed in General McClellan's position, most generals could possibly have realized this. In order to understand Mr. Stanton it is necessary to read General Pope's account of his interview with

that gentleman, given on page 449. One of my friends assures me that in reading it he literally "laughed till he cried," and never fully understood what the expression meant before doing so. I can quite understand it. Laughter is said to be due to our being impelled by two contradictory feelings at the same time. That certainly is the condition under which one reads those pages. There is scarcely any folly possible in relation to the command of an army which Mr. Stanton does not propose with the gravest face to General McDowell. At the same time, the man is evidently sincere, and convinced that, being a clever politician and holding the position of War Minister, every principle of war—*as he understood war*—which he enunciated must be right, and therefore ought to be obeyed without question. It is difficult to pronounce whether the image that rises before us is that of the ignorant stage charlatan who, because his legs are decked with military boots, thinks himself every inch a soldier, or that of a grave Minister who is charged with the solemn responsibility of a great Nation's destiny and with the lives and fortunes of thousands of his fellow-citizens. Let me put a few of the points together.

If there be one thing more important than another in the command of any army, but more especially of one recently gathered together in a hurry from civil life, it is that officers and men should have confidence in their leader. It is essential that they should know and understand him, and, from their previous experience, should feel sure he is going to lead them to victory. "Therefore," says Mr. Stanton, "I cannot be wrong in withdrawing General Pope from the Army of the Mississippi, where he is known and liked and has been doing very well, to take command of the army of Virginia, where no one knows much more than his name, his previous military operations not having been on a scale to command universal attention."

Promotion of a junior over the heads of men very senior to him in the service is often very wise and necessary; but unless it is done for reasons which are known and appreciated by the army as a whole, such as tend to inspire the army with confidence, it is pretty sure to lead to serious friction. "Therefore," says Mr. Stanton, "let us proceed as follows: There are those three corps, which have been chiefly formed under McClellan and are extremely proud of themselves as forming part of the old Army of the Potomac. They have already begun to acquire a certain

spirit of their own; disasters have overtaken them for the moment (in consequence, as they believed, of their having been withdrawn from McClellan and foolishly scattered). Let us, therefore, select an officer from a far-off region, belonging to a force of which the Army of the Potomac has a certain amount of soldierly jealousy. The deeds of that distant hero will certainly not be appreciated at their full value by the followers of McClellan. But never mind; let us put this unknown leader over the heads of the three men now holding high command in that army, each well known to his own corps, and each senior to the man we select to command them." With disadvantages of such a nature against him, it may still be necessary sometimes to put an able junior over his seniors, in order that he should undertake some special task, provided he clearly sees his way to accomplish it, and feels confidence in himself. "Therefore," said Mr. Stanton, "let us select General Pope to undertake a task which he himself regards as a 'forlorn hope.' Despite his imploring remonstrances that he may be sent back to his old army, we will order him to 'submit cheerfully,' which will, of course, inspire him with all the confidence he needs." Surely, surely, so far at least every man who manages a large business concern will follow me in seeing that all these propositions denote an insanity that would be ludicrous, if it were not, in such a matter, so terribly criminal.

Upon General Pope, not a strong commander, was now forced the monstrous scheme of moving forward his already hopelessly-scattered army to "demonstrate" within striking distance of Richmond just at the time when McClellan, deprived of that very force, was about to be reduced to inaction by the battle of Gaines's Mill and the retreat to the James River at this junction. General Pope showed his appreciation of the position by urging the appointment of some one general to command the two armies, who could then combine their action for a common purpose. It was a necessity entailed by the attempts to operate at once with both armies, instead of keeping one of them on the defensive and weakened so as to make the other very strong for rapid, offensive operations along the most telling line for an advance. It is obvious that the retreat of McClellan to the James River did make General Pope's position, to the north of Richmond, exceptionally dangerous. It placed the Confederate army absolutely between the two Federal armies, and greatly increased the distance be-

tween them. It is not, however, I think, the fact, as General Pope assumes, that the Confederates were "ready to exchange Richmond for Washington." For Jackson's movement to oppose Pope was not made till Lee was convinced that McClellan's army was not in a condition to carry out any further offensive movement. The wide turning movement of Jackson on Manassas Junction, and the movement northwards of Longstreet's corps, did not take place till McClellan had begun to evacuate the Peninsula.

Whatever mistakes General Pope may have made, it is clear that the disasters of this campaign were due to the order from Washington which required him to maintain an advanced position on the Rappahannock, and which gave him reason to suppose that his communications with Manassas would be guarded by troops independent of his own army, but which were nowhere within reach when they were wanted. For that failure General Halleck was no doubt directly responsible; but the great mistake lay in that action of the Administration, which can hardly be better described than in Mr. Lincoln's words applied later in the War: they "swopped horses whilst they were crossing the stream." They allowed McClellan to go off with his army to the Peninsula whilst he was at least nominally in command of the armies of the United States, and as soon as he was fully committed to the enterprise, they so completely upset all his arrangements as to bring about the condition of things which made it necessary to have with the Government in Washington a "General-in-Chief" of all the National forces. General Halleck was selected for the post—a most unhappy, most unfortunate selection.

I do not much appreciate any part of General Halleck's conduct in the War, either when he was in the West or after he arrived at Washington. He appears to have chiefly distinguished himself in the West by snubbing the two ablest soldiers he had under him, Generals Grant and Sherman. He appears to have chiefly distinguished himself at Washington by first snubbing General McClellan, then by placing Pope in a hopeless position, then, immediately after, by giving a positive assurance that Pope was in no danger, to be followed quickly by a complete loss of heart when that General's army came hurrying back in confusion to the Potomac. Then we find him, when panic-stricken for the safety of Washington, throw all responsibility on McClellan, the man he had previously snubbed. As soon as McClellan's presence

had restored confidence and *morale* to Pope's demoralized army, he does his best to prevent McClellan from striking effective blows against the very much weaker and, for the time, necessarily dispersed army of General Lee, and we see him, ignorantly and stupidly, incidentally throwing away the forces which were compelled to surrender at Harper's Ferry. It is not, therefore, from any special sympathy with General Halleck that I am induced to think he was, from the first, placed in a false position. He had to take up and accept for better or worse the fatuous plan devised by Secretary Stanton, against which both McClellan and Pope had equally protested. He had to face immediate emergencies before he could possibly have made himself really acquainted with all the circumstances of the new field of war into which he had been suddenly pitchforked.

Hence my own conviction that for this, as for most of the other misfortunes experienced by the Federal troops, the verdict of history will ultimately hold responsible the Administration at Washington rather than the generals who commanded in the field. And yet it is both striking and interesting to see how much the personal character of Lincoln himself rose superior to his surroundings. His very modesty unfortunately left him, as regards all military operations, too much in the hands of his Secretary for War. But compare Mr. Stanton, with "large eye-glasses," "dishevelled appearance," "presence not imposing," "abrupt manner," "speech short and rather dictatorial," employed in dictating orders which were rank nonsense, with the quiet, modest manner, the simple, natural dignity, the genial humor, the shrewd common-sense, which appear in every story told of President Lincoln. One sees clearly enough that, though General McClellan was probably wrong as to the cause which he assigned for Mr. Stanton's opposition to him, he was right enough in attributing his difficulties to the Secretary for War, and not to the President. Mr. Lincoln was, from a military point of view, clearly mistaken in believing that *the* one way to get at Richmond was by making straight there from Washington. It is impossible, however, if one puts one's self at all in his place, not to see how nobly he faced the difficulties of his position, and how anxiously he endeavored to do his duty to his country.

WOLSELEY.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

THE TELEGRAPH MONOPOLY.

BY PROFESSOR RICHARD T. ELY, OF JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

THERE was something ludicrous in the surprise and consternation expressed by the general public when it became known that the Western Union Telegraph Company had acquired the lines of the Baltimore and Ohio. It was manifestly a hard, and at the time it seemed almost a shattering, blow to those who worship the idol of "private competition" as a sufficient power to save us from all industrial evils. Yet nothing was more groundless than the expectation that the temporary competition between these two powerful rivals could have any other termination than that which we have witnessed, for the telegraph business is, in its very nature, a monopoly. Experience and reason alike teach that combination between rival telegraph lines can be predicted almost with the certainty of a coming eclipse. Fifty years ago a clear-headed merchant-prince of England uttered this famous dictum: "Where combination is possible competition is impossible."

Two years ago Professor Henry C. Adams demonstrated, in his monograph, "The Relation of the State to Industrial Action," the impossibility of competition in a business like the telegraph service, and in July, 1887, at Chautauqua, when the telegraph officials were protesting that there was no thought in their minds of combination, I used these words in a public address, basing what I said, not upon any special knowledge of the affairs of the two great companies, but on scientific principles:

"One telegraph company can send telegrams all over the country cheaper than two; hence the absorption of all companies, save the Baltimore and Ohio, by the Western Union.* It is so in the nature of things that I do not see how the Baltimore and Ohio can permanently resist the economic gravitation which draws it to its rival."

* I left out of consideration, as not worthy of special notice, certain minor attempts at competition.

As it is of the first importance, in a discussion of the telegraph question, to grasp the fact that monopoly is inevitable, it is well to give a little space to an interrogation of past experience and of reason. First, it must be noticed that, while telegraph lines extend over the entire globe and while this industry is forty years old, the world has yet to see one single example of permanent successful competition. Over thirty companies were chartered in England, but it was never possible to secure more than temporary competition, and the attempt to secure competition was finally abandoned as impracticable and unsatisfactory. There were over fifty companies in the United States in 1851, but the most important consolidated in the same year, and combination has ever since been the end of attempted competition.

Of course, there must be some grounds in the nature of things for this, and these are, in fact, sufficiently evident on reflection. Telegraph companies always consolidate because one company can do all the business much more cheaply than two or more: consequently all derive a profit from combination. The struggle or warfare which precedes this is merely to determine the terms on which the two will unite. Strictly speaking, it is not competition at all, for competition is not a war of extinction, but a constant, permanent pressure. Why do not all the great dry-goods houses in New York combine? Why did not the late A. T. Stewart consolidate his business with that of Lord & Taylor and of Arnold & Constable? Because it was not to their manifest advantage; but it is always in the interest of natural monopolies to unite.

Mr. Farrer, in his work, "The State in its Relation to Trade," gives the following characteristics of natural monopolies, which will help to render this clearer:

> "*First*—What they supply is necessary.
>
> "*Second*—They occupy peculiarly favored spots or lines of land.
>
> "*Third*—The article or convenience they supply is used at the place where and in connection with the plant or machinery by which it is supplied.
>
> "*Fourth*—This article or convenience can, in general, be largely, if not indefinitely, increased without proportionate increase in plant and capital.
>
> "*Fifth*—Certainty and harmonious arrangement, which can only be attained by unity, are paramount considerations."

We see, then, that there is a certain class of pursuits for which there is no escape from monopoly. Without attempting an enumeration of them, I will remark that gas- and water-works are

local monopolies and are for a municipality what telegraphs are for a nation; and the good people of Baltimore had scarcely recovered from the shock which the absorption of the Baltimore and Ohio Telegraph caused them before they were again startled by the consolidation of their two gas companies and an increase of 200 per cent. in price. Had they understood the fundamental principles of industrial science, they would not have allowed their streets to be torn up time and time again in their fruitless attempts to grasp such a Utopia as competition in the gas supply.

We consequently see that we have a choice between two alternatives, and there is no middle ground between them. These are (a) private monopoly and (b) public monopoly; and the desirability of each will be considered in the order named.

Private monopolies are contrary alike to the spirit of English law and American institutions, and must be pronounced odious. There is no place for them among a liberty-loving people, and the attempt to reconcile us to them is as difficult as to fit a square pin into a round hole. One thing has been decided beyond all doubt: private monopolies cannot be left unregulated and uncontrolled. The attempt to do that has been definitely abandoned in the United States; but it cannot be said that regulation and control have worked satisfactorily. Regulation and control mean interference of government in private affairs—a bad thing, complicating government and opening the flood-gates of corruption. Private monopolies are, at this moment, the cause of that perpetual interference of the government which we witness all about us, and are the most fruitful cause of corruption in public life; incomparably more so than the government management and ownership of public business. To deny this seems to me simply a confession of profound ignorance of what is passing about us and among us daily. A bill is brought into the legislature to regulate the price of gas supplied by a private company, and this at once brings about a conflict between the public interest and a powerful private interest. It involves, in its very nature, a strong and often irresistible temptation to bribery and corruption, and that in two ways. On the one hand, monopolies attempt to prevent unjust legislation by abundant use of money, and, indirectly, by the bestowal of special favors and privileges, such as passes on railways, opportunities to buy stock or presents of stock, freight rebates, telegraph franks given to members of Congress, and so

forth. On the other hand, unscrupulous legislators bring in bills attacking corporations, purposely to be bought off, so that otherwise upright men are almost forced to use money improperly to protect themselves and those whom they represent. Between the two currents political life becomes demoralized, as is well known, and the chief cause is the private monopoly. Corruption inheres in its very nature, in its very essence. It is a bad thing and must remain such. Why dwell on this? Does not one of the most powerful, and in some respects one of the most admirable, corporations of the United States maintain, as a regular part of its business, a corruption bureau to manipulate and purchase legislatures? Do not street-car and gas companies perpetually interfere in politics? Is there not a prominent city in our West in which both Republican and Democratic members of the council are nominated by a private street-car company? Do not lobbies supported by corporations steal bills from House and Senate files? After a bill regulating the price of gas had been stolen from the Senate files in Maryland, was it not necessary for Governor Jackson to go the State House and watch a new bill pass with his own eyes and sign it then and there, lest it should be stolen?

The public monopoly is at any rate the lesser of the two evils. Doubtless that is not an ideal thing; doubtless we shall not for a long time find perfection. What we want is simplification in public business, and this is promoted every time a private monopoly is abolished by the substitution of a public monopoly. How simple the post-office business! How few opportunities, comparatively, it offers for fraud! How complex, how intricate, how passing ordinary understanding, the relations between our governments and our railway corporations!

It is on account of these reasons that I desire government monopoly of the telegraph business, and I will at once state why it is desirable that a government should purchase existing lines rather than compete with other lines, in particular with the Western Union.

First, the competition by the government with existing lines would increase the expense of the telegraph service, and would thus occasion a loss which would be by no means counterbalanced by the fact that lines could be constructed more cheaply than purchased. The private companies would make a fight for business between great centres, and would take away some of the

most profitable business, while they would leave all the poor business for the government lines. This would necessitate higher rates than would be requisite under a public monopoly. Why can government carry a letter three thousand miles for two cents? Because it has a monopoly. Again, any private company would certainly resort to corrupt measures either to ward off government competition or to moderate it. Can any one fail to see the hand of private express companies in many of our post-office laws and regulations? Why does our Federal Government send newspapers for publishers for a cent a pound and require sixteen cents a pound for merchandise? Why does it add to excessive charges for that business which competes with express companies, annoying and absurd regulations? Such things are unknown where powerful express companies do not exist.

Competition between government enterprise and private enterprise has been tried in the railway business in Germany and elsewhere, but has not been satisfactory, and has generally been abandoned.

Some cry "paternalism" when government telegraphy is mentioned. This word "paternalism" has become a prize bogey with which to frighten the unthinking. The state is not something above us, doing something for us. It is one kind of coöperation. It shows greater self-reliance to provide a telegraph service for ourselves than to say that "we are so dishonest and inefficient in government methods that we dare not trust ourselves. Will not some rich men kindly provide us with a good telegraph system, and please give us cheap rates?" It has always seemed to me that those who call government enterprise "paternalism" have never become real Americans. It is beginning to be seen that such designation is unscientific. The English economist, Professor Sidgwick, of Cambridge, styles public enterprises like the telegraph and municipal gas-works an extension of the principle of individualism, and not socialism at all.

It is, however, urged that public ownership of telegraphs is a step towards socialism. Why does not government bake bread for us as well as send telegrams? Questions like this are asked. Manifestly the two functions are not analogous. The one is a natural monopoly; the other not. The tendency to absorb natural monopolies shows no tendency to absorb all business.

We live in a time of expanding industry, and government

business has grown, as has all other business; but there is no cause for alarm. While there has been an absolute growth in government business, such statistics as we have tend to show that, as compared with the amount of private business, there has been a relative decrease.

Another false alarm has been raised by the cry "centralization." The truth is, we are apparently living in a time of relative decentralization. During the last sixty years in Ohio, the expenses of the local political units, such as county, city, school district, have increased far more than twice as rapidly as those of the State; and investigation in the countries of Europe, as well as in the American States, shows very generally that during the past thirty or forty years local expenses have increased twice as rapidly as those of the central State governments. Now, as expenses are a tolerably fair measure of functions, we can safely say that local business increases faster than central State business; and that we live in a time when government is not extending its business as rapidly as private persons, and when the business of central governments is not increasing so rapidly as the business of local governments.

One other objection is increased political "patronage." In itself, "patronage" for members of legislatures is not a good thing, but in the purchase of the telegraph, rather than in attempted control of it, the removal of opportunities for fraud and oppression and the simplification of government business would more than counterbalance the evils of increased patronage. Secondly, patronage can be remedied by better civil-service rules, and the very increase in the civil-service staff would strengthen existing civil-service rules and would force the importance of civil-service reform upon the attention of the country. Thirdly, the telegraph business would be combined with the post-office business, and as in many offices the same man could attend to both, there would not be so large an increase in government employees as one would at first imagine. The number of Presidential appointments would increase only slightly, and the number of post-offices brought under the civil-service rules as they exist even now would be increased, because many more offices would have the necessary number of employees. Fourthly, as the business of government increases, there is, in modern times, a constant tendency to improvement, and this tendency is so marked that few exceptions

to it can be adduced. Why was civil-service reform introduced into the United States? Precisely on account of the growing importance of government business, and on this very account civil-service regulations were introduced in Philadelphia.

One reason why our government has been so poor is the indifference of upright men of intelligence and means; but this tends to disappear as they realize the importance of government. When government really amounts to something, it offers a career to men of talent. On all these accounts there has been a remarkable improvement in the art of government throughout the civilized world during the past twenty years. I believe no assertion is safer than the prediction that the purchase of telegraph lines would improve our civil service immediately, and soon lead to measures which would diminish the "patronage" of elected office holders, such as Senators, Representatives, President. I think also that the wire-pullers appreciate this. There is not one of the worse class of "spoils" politicians who does not oppose an extension of the business of government. The shrewdest of them must see that to make government an important business agency will mean death to "practical politics."

In conclusion, we must ask the testimony of experience, and this in all countries where a government telegraph has been tried is unanimous in favor of public telegraph service. In none of these countries would the people even consider the subject of replacing public telegraphs by private telegraphs, and everywhere the experience of the United States is regarded as a warning against private telegraph companies. England's experience is instructive. Private companies were there tried until they proved to be intolerable; then they were purchased. Elsewhere in Europe the telegraph was from the start a public institution, and this is the result: while the estimated cost of telegraphs in all other States of Europe is 282,000,000 francs, the estimated cost to England of her telegraphs is 272,000,000 francs; in other words, owing to unsuccessful attempts to secure a good private telegraph system, England paid nearly as much for her telegraphs as all the other countries in Europe put together.

The following statistics show the increased facilities offered the public and the resulting increase of business. In 1868 private lines connected about 1,000 cities. In 1870 the telegraph became a state institution; in 1882 there were 5,595 telegraph stations, and

in 1888, 6,810. The telegrams forwarded in 1868 numbered six millions; in 1882, 31,500,000; in 1888, 53,403,425. It is said that technical improvements have not recently been introduced in England, but this is false. While American telegraphs are resisting improvements, and, according to uncontradicted newspaper reports, are buying important inventions of Edison and locking them up lest they should benefit any one, the English telegraph has made wonderful progress. In an address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at the meeting held in Bath, 1888, Mr. W. H. Preece, the best authority in England on the subject, said: "The telegraphic system of England has been brought to the highest pitch of perfection." He mentions also the fact that American newspapers chronicled it as a "big thing" when 500,000 words were sent by our telegraphic system over the wires in one night at the time of the last Republican Convention in Chicago, when President Harrison was nominated; whereas the English telegraph sent 1,500,000 words from the central telegraph office in London in one night, when Mr. Gladstone introduced his Home-Rule Bill on April 8, 1886. Moreover, we can judge our telegraphic managers "out of their own mouth." They declare themselves incompetent to place their wires underground, whereas of 1,745 lines of wire entering the central station in London not one is open, and some wires extend underground for distances from twelve to twenty-two miles from that office.

The government telegraphs of Europe have made rapid strides in improvements, and much progress has been due to the *Journal Télégraphique*, the organ of the international union of government telegraphs. On the whole, in the way of supplying conveniences, forming international combinations, and in leading in cheap rates, government telegraphs have done far more than private lines, and their service to-day is for the ordinary private individual—one is almost tempted to say—incomparably better. Quite as much inducement for improvement is offered as in private telegraphy—in fact, even more. First, each state takes a pride in establishing low rates, and so there is a kind of international competition. Secondly, each man at the head of the telegraph service wants to make a better showing than others. The people call for low rates and bring pressure to bear, and at the same time the administration dreads to apply to the public

treasury to make good a deficiency; thus the officials must be alert and active. The public demand for good and efficient service is more powerful with a public telegraph than with a private company.

The experience of both England and the United States shows that a few great centres are tolerably well served by private companies, but other places miserably. A few years ago I wanted to send a telegram of importance from Richmond, Virginia, early on Monday morning, but the telegraph office was locked until seven o'clock in the morning. This could have happened, I believe, in no city of seventy five thousand inhabitants in western Europe. During the summer of 1887 I sent a telegram from Baltimore to Fredonia, in New York State (about forty miles from Buffalo), on Saturday; on Sunday, I sent a second—both of great importance; and on Sunday, receiving no answer to either, started for Fredonia, to arrive on the same day on which the telegrams came —namely, Monday. That could scarcely have happened in any country in western Europe; and it is to be noticed that post-offices with us offer better facilities than telegraph offices, for even in small places they are open at least once on Sunday, although there is less call for it. These concrete illustrations are given because they are merely typical. As to poor quality of service as seen in frequent mistakes, it is needless to speak. Every one knows that.

There has been an attempt to make it appear that prices are low in this country, but this results either from ignorance or from willful intent to deceive. They are as high as they profitably can be. It is ridiculous to compare the charge for telegraphing a mile here and a mile in Europe, because the cost of service is not greatly influenced by distance. Some claim that it is not at all influenced thereby, while others even maintain that, on an average, the actual outlay for a domestic telegram to a remote part of the country is less than to a nearer point. This is going too far, but without entering into technical details, it can readily be seen on reflection that a great part of the labor and expense of sending a domestic telegram is absolutely independent of distance. This matter of distance is so subordinate that all European countries except Russia and Turkey neglect it altogether, and have one uniform price for all domestic telegrams, as for letters. The average price in the United States should be compared with this,

Let us place the average price in the United States at fifty cents, and as it is so much more to many distant points, it will be conceded that sufficient allowance has been made for the legitimate added cost of long distances and sparsely-settled districts. If, then, this average charge, with due allowance for great distances, is fifty cents for ten words in the United States, we have a basis for comparison.

England charges twelve cents for twelve words; Germany, seventeen cents for ten words, and deducts a cent and a quarter for every word less than ten; Belgium, nine cents for ten words; Italy, eighteen cents for fifteen words; Switzerland, ten cents for ten words. It will be perceived that the charges for telegrams are higher in the United States than elsewhere. On the other hand, letters are actually carried, and notwithstanding long distances our government sends letters as cheaply as any country and more cheaply than some countries.

Many of these countries, it should be further remembered, derive a net revenue from the telegraph, which enables them to lessen taxation by so much. The English telegraph has not yielded net revenue because the policy of England has been to reduce rates and improve service rather than to seek profits. It now about pays expenses, and if the recent rapid increase of revenue continues, the English telegraph will also soon yield net revenue to the public treasury.

It has been urged that a private telegraph company is responsible for errors, but business men say that this nominal legal responsibility is actually a farce. Moreover, government can, if it is desired, make itself responsible for errors. On the continent of Europe the post-office pays damages if a registered letter is lost.

Finally, a world telegraph union has been discussed, and it would bring great advantage, as has the Universal Postal Union; but the chief obstacle in the way has been the private telegraphs of the United States. If we, in this country, buy the private lines and establish a public service, a world telegraph union will soon be formed, and that will be another one of those bonds which unite nations and make for international peace.

RICHARD T. ELY.

OUR FUTURE NAVY.

BY S. B. LUCE, REAR-ADMIRAL, UNITED STATES NAVY.

In his "Essay on History," Lord Macaulay observes that "no past event has any intrinsic importance; the knowledge of it is valuable only as it leads us to form just calculations with respect to the future." Agreeably to that precept, a retrospective survey, so appropriate in this centennial year, will enable us to form just calculations as to what may be reasonably anticipated in respect to the development of our new navy. A necessary condition of the forecast is that no violent political eruptions or international complications shall disturb the course hitherto followed by legislation on naval affairs.

Before proceeding further let us inquire what constitutes a navy. A navy is, in one sense, a sea army. Or, to speak more correctly, its principal constituent, a fleet, is a sea army, to which all the other component parts are but subsidiary. The French habitually speak of *les armées de terre et de mer*. The analogy between a land army and a sea army is often so close that at some points it merges into identity; and in certain problems of war the two may be reasoned upon as identical. Thus the main body of the land army, composed of infantry, may be compared to a fleet of battle-ships. The infantry of the line acts in masses, and on the field of battle constitutes the principal fighting force. The same is true of a fleet. Well disciplined, a mass of infantry in column or in square is almost impenetrable. Witness the terrible, but fruitless, charges of the French cuirassiers on the solid masses of the English infantry at Waterloo. One of the great lessons of war is that cavalry charges, except against cavalry, are indecisive unless supported by infantry. Says Hamley in his "Operations of War": "All the formidable inroads of Napoleon's horsemen on the British line availed nothing for the want of in-

fantry support." The same principle, precisely, applies to the operations of the sea army. The inroads of cruisers, which are analogous to cavalry, will avail but little unless supported by battle-ships. This position is incontestable. Napoleon regarded the infantry as the *arm of battles* and the *sinews of the army.* Infantry, in short, is the first instrument of victory. It finds a powerful support, however, in the cavalry and the artillery.

These tenets are admitted by all military writers, and are universally accepted. Let it now be asked how an army could be organized *without* infantry of the line. The soldier would probably answer that the question is an absurd one and unworthy of a serious reply. And yet that is just what we are trying to do with our sea army—otherwise known as the navy of the United States. That is to say, we are pretending to build up a navy without the constituents of a line of battle. We are building cruisers of various sizes, which correspond to the cavalry and light artillery of the land army; and we have monitors for coast and harbor defence, which supplement our fortifications; but we have no battle-ships to correspond to the infantry of the line, which constitutes the main strength of the line of battle.

James, one of the best historians of the English navy, remarks that the strength of a navy is *the line of battle,* rather than its detached or frigate force. "The latter may cruise about," he says, "and interrupt trade, or levy contributions on some comparatively insignificant colonial territory; but it is the former that arrays itself before formidable batteries and strikes dread into the heart of the parent state." Vice-Admiral Penhoat, a distinguished officer of the French navy, and an author of note, reaches the same conclusion. "The most powerful agent that can be employed for the defence of the coast," he observes, "is the fleet of line-of-battle ships. That is *the* active force of all others that is capable of defending any point on the coast that may be threatened by an enemy." After discussing the necessary qualifications of a battle-ship, he says:

"It will be seen, from what has preceded, that the fleet of the line is the foundation of a navy; and that no operations at sea of importance, such as bombardments, the transportation of troops, etc., etc., can be undertaken with security, unless the enemy's fleet of the line has first been rendered powerless."

"It is the line of battle, then, which should take precedence in its development over those accessory forces which, when joined to it, constitute together a navy. The secondary forces—the cruisers, transports, armored coast-guards, etc., etc.—

should, each according to its importance, have a certain relative proportion to the whole ; but they *should not impede the development of the principal power.*"

The policy thus clearly lined out has been advocated by the executive and combated by the legislative branch of the United States Government since the beginning of our existence as a nation, and up to a comparatively recent period ; and describes accurately the course followed in England, where everything relating to the navy is done seriously and with a definite purpose. Chief-Engineer J. W. King, United States Navy, in his admirable report on "European Ships of War," under the head of "The British Navy," writes:

"It is to the production of the most powerful sea-going fighting ships that the resources of the navy are first directed: ships sufficiently armed to resist the projectiles of any ordinary kind; sufficiently armed to silence forts, or to meet the enemy under any conditions proffered; sufficiently fast to choose the time and place to fight; and sufficiently buoyant to carry coal and stores into any ocean."

This statement finds emphatic confirmation in the recent Admiralty programme announced by Lord George Hamilton, the First Lord of the Admiralty. In brief, that programme calls for the building, between April, 1889, and April, 1894, of seventy vessels of war, ten of which are to be battle-ships, and sixty, cruisers of different types. The report says :

"A battle-ship, when completed, is not entirely efficient unless she has certain small vessels attached to her as scouts ; and we consider that, out of the seventy vessels, twenty are the *satellites* of the battle-ships. The remaining cruisers will be effective whether used in squadrons or individually. . . . Later on, when an increase is made to our battle-ships, each battle-ship will be accompanied by two smaller vessels ; and thus there will be no drain upon our force of independent cruisers."

The strength of the British line is to be brought up, in the near future, to something over one hundred battle-ships, with cruisers, great and small, in proportion.

Let us now suppose the battle-ship to be subtracted from the floating force of Great Britain. How long could she hold Gibraltar and Malta, control the Suez Canal, and maintain her Indian Empire by the eastern route ? How long could she hold the line from London to Halifax, Esquimault, and India by the western ? How long could she prevent Germany from establishing a military port on the Scheldt ? How long could she hold the great strategic points at Jamaica, Barbadoes, and St. Lucie, which dominate the West Indies, the Spanish Main, and the Isthmian Canal, which will eventually open to her a short cut to the Pacific ? Without bat-

tle-ships the whole British Empire would crumble to pieces, "and, like the baseless fabric of a vision, . . . leave not a rack behind."

In the absence of anything and everything that might resemble a naval policy, we have reversed the usual order of naval development. The battle-ship being the very foundation of a navy, and the United States having no battle-ship, it is plain that in a military sense—the only sense in which a navy can be discussed—she has no navy. Not only that, but she has no foundation whereon to build one. She has the necessaries only—the *satellites*, the cruisers, and the coast-guard ships. The great central body about which the satellites revolve—the solid masses of the line, which give the cruisers moral and material support—are altogether wanting. In military parlance, we have a a few light infantry (cruisers) for scouts ; and cavalry (cruisers) for reconnoitring ; but, in case of repulse, there is no main body of the line to fall back upon. One of the functions of light infantry is to protect the flanks of the army. Our cruisers are to protect the flanks of—what ? Nothing ! There is no main body, no line of battle, no battle-ship, no navy—nothing, in short, but accessories.

Let us test the truth of this. International complications arise of such a character that the government finds it necessary to send a number of our best ships to a distant point, Samoa for example. On reaching the place designated, the American admiral, in the "Baltimore," as flag-ship, and accompanied by the "Newark," "Philadelphia," and "San Francisco," all splendid 4,000-ton ships, of the most approved types, finds himself confronted by four battle-ships to dispute his way. The vital parts of the foreign ships and the crews are well protected by heavy masses of steel; while the sides of the "Baltimore" and her consorts, though of steel, are but little thicker than a single number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, or, to be exact, five-eighths of an inch thick—sides of no greater powers of resistance than the frigate "Constitution," launched in 1797, possessed. Do the people of this country expect their admiral to risk a battle under such circumstances ? Hardly, for those ships were designed expressly *to run away from battle-ships*, as will presently be shown. That is the fundamental idea which is guiding the development of the new navy: to run away.

It may be observed here that the word *fleet* is sometimes used to express the entire floating force of the navy. This use of the

word is common both in England and in France. In a more limited and technical sense, a *fleet* is an assembly of twelve or more battle-ships. Used in this latter sense, Great Britain will soon be able to put afloat seven or eight fleets, each fleet filled up to its tactical complement of twelve battle-ships; each battle-ship accompanied by two satellites; with cruisers, torpedo depôt-ships, and hospital-ships; while cruisers, acting independently, will be left to protect her own commerce and annihilate that of an enemy. If the military necessities of England compel her to maintain, say, six fleets and their accessories, and the Great Powers of Europe keep afloat proportional numbers, is it not to the interest of the people of this country to have a floating force of something more than mere accessories? Is it not to the interest of our people to have a navy in reality, instead of the semblance of one? Is it not to our interest to have at least *one* fleet of twelve battle-ships? That is the question the Executive has been presenting to Congress for the past one hundred years.

With all her enormous iron ship-building facilities, England allows from three and a half to four years to build a battle-ship. In this country it would probably take a little longer. The keel of the "Chicago," which is not a battle-ship, was laid in 1883, and she is not yet ready for sea; and this at a time when the government is much pressed for ships. Should either of the battle-ships "Maine" or "Texas" ever be launched, her time on the stocks will probably cover a period of from seven to eight years. Making the most liberal allowance for increase of skilled labor in iron ship-building, it would be twenty years at least before the United States could get a fleet of battle-ships to sea,—and in these days wars are reckoned by months. If the American people contemplate building up a navy, it is not a day too soon to formulate some definite plan of development beyond mere accessories.

If there is any one fact made clear by the history of the past, it is the true function of our navy. The rôle of a navy is essentially *offensive*, as contrasted with sea-coast fortifications, which are *defensive*. This broad distinction must be borne in mind, if the persistent, but unavailing, efforts of our highest naval authorities, in time past, to organize a navy, are to be understood.

"The proper duty of our navy," it was declared long since, "is *not* coast or river defence; it has a more glorious sphere—that of the *offensive*. Confident that this is the true policy as regards the employment of the navy proper, we doubt not that it

will, in the future, be acted on, as it has been in the past; and that the results, as regards both honor and advantage, will be expanded commensurately with its enlargement. . . . In order, however, that the navy may always assume and maintain that active and energetic deportment, in *offensive operations*, which is at the same time so consistent with its functions and so consonant with its spirit, we have shown that it must not be occupied with mere coast defences."

The great principles on which our entire system of sea-coast defence has been erected have been laid down with mature deliberation by our highest military and naval authorities. "The means of defence," say they, "for the seaboard of the United States, constituting a system, may be classed as follows: First, a navy; second, fortifications; third, interior communications by land and water; and fourth, a regular army and well-organized militia." * The term Navy is defined as "that portion only of our military marine which is capable of moving in safety upon the ocean, and transporting itself speedily to distant points." This can be done only by battle-ships equal, if not superior, in fighting power to the average battle-ship of a possible enemy. "Floating batteries, etc., etc.," were regarded as pertaining to land defences, and were deemed "powerful auxiliaries." "The *Navy*," it was said, "being the only species of *offensive force* compatible with our institutions, it will be prepared to act the great part which its early achievements have promised, and to which its high destiny will lead."

Benjamin Stoddert, our first Secretary of the Navy, thoroughly understood the office of a navy. In a communication to the House of Representatives under date of December 29, 1798, after advancing the most cogent reasons, he recommended the building of twelve battle-ships and as many frigates. "Had we possessed this force a few years ago," he adds, "we should not have lost, by depredations on our trade, four times the sum necessary to have created and maintained it during the whole time the war has existed in Europe." In a subsequent report, January 12, 1801, the Secretary enunciates a sound principle. He says, in effect: Let our enterprising privateersmen prey on the enemy's commerce. The government should "*attend principally to a provision for battle-ships and frigates.*" The two reports are note-

* It may not be out of place here to explain that in classing the navy, which is the arm of *offence*, among the elements of *defence*, the words are to be taken in their military sense. Thus we have many instances in history of "defensive-offensive' campaigns, where the defence takes the initiative. The true war of defence, military writers affirm, seeks every occasion to *meet* the enemy. The French defend themselves by attacking.

worthy as clearly indicating the true lines of naval development, by the building, first of all, of battle-ships, and showing that the preying upon an enemy's commerce was altogether secondary and not the first objective of a navy.

It cannot be said that Congress responded with alacrity to these earnest appeals. We were paying tribute at the time to the Barbary powers. French cruisers were depredating our commerce and English vessels of war were impressing seamen out of our merchant vessels; but the navy which could, and eventually did, put a stop to these indignities, found little favor with our national legislature. The Naval Committee, reporting to the House, December 17, 1811, said:

"The important engine of national strength and national security, which is formed by a naval force, has hitherto, in the opinion of the committee, *been treated with a neglect highly impolitic*, or supported by a spirit so languid as, while it has preserved the existence of the establishment, has had the effect of loading it with the imputations of wasteful expense and comparative inefficiency."

We were on the verge of war with England when this "languid spirit" in regard to naval affairs prevailed in the House of Representatives. In 1799 Congress had authorized the building of six battle-ships; but, the amount appropriated being insufficient, no steps had been taken towards setting them up, beyond the purchase of some ship timber, so that a few frigates and sloops-of-war were all we had of a navy.

On the 19th of June, 1812, war was proclaimed against England. Elated by the success which attended our little navy in its first encounter with the English at sea, Congress, now that war was actually begun, authorized the President, "*as soon as the materials could be procured*," to cause to be built, equipped, and employed four battle-ships and six frigates. "This was the first step," says Cooper, the historian of the navy, "that was ever actually put in execution towards establishing a marine that might prove of material moment in influencing the results of a war." But—and this is one of the impressive lessons of history—although hostilities lasted two and a half years, the first battle-ship to be launched, the "Independence," was too late to take part in the war. The successes attending the War of 1812, and the placing of the Navy Department upon a better footing, by giving the Secretary of the Navy a staff of experienced officers—the navy commissioners—to assist him in his duties, excited a passing interest in naval affairs. This was not a little

enhanced by the brief war of 1815 with the Barbary powers. Under the impulse of this feeling, Congress authorized the augmentation of the navy to twelve battle-ships. Owing to the limited amount of the annual appropriations, and the small number of seamen allowed by law, but four ships were kept in active service. Three were during many years laid up "in ordinary," and five held in reserve on the stocks in such an advanced stage of completion that, on the first sign of approaching hostilities, they could have been launched and equipped for sea in a comparatively short space of time. Built of well-seasoned live-oak, they could almost be said to defy the ravages of time. They were broken up, or diverted to other purposes than originally intended, only when the type of battle-ship they represented had become obsolete. They were, with but two exceptions, the very best specimens of naval architecture of the period and distinctively American in weight of batteries, great strength, capacity, sea-going qualities—everything, in short, that constituted a high order of excellence in a battle-ship of their day.

A flag-ship, it may be remarked, is a fair exponent of the strength of a navy. In the noon-tide of our naval power, the flag (or broad pennant) of the commander-in-chief was flown by a battle-ship. To-day it is displayed either from a second-rate, that has already reached the limits of usefulness, or from a third-rate but little better off. These are soon to be replaced by a class of flag-ships whose character shall be portrayed later on.

In 1823 President Monroe announced the doctrine which has since taken his name. It embraced two interdependent parts—one political, one military. The former only is now remembered. The formal declaration that the American continents "are not to be considered as subject to colonization by any European power" carried with it an obligation to maintain the means by which that policy could be enforced. Hence the President's admirable letter of January 30, 1824, to the United States House of Representatives against an undue reduction of the navy. The message was accompanied by a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, in which the naval policy of the government was plainly stated.

"When the vessels now authorized by law to be built," he writes, "are completed, there will be twelve battle-ships. . . . The vessels having been built, we must train officers to command and manage them. . . . A great portion of the science of the naval commanders can be acquired only on the ocean and by years of labor and discipline."

Accompanying these letters was the draft of a bill for a naval peace establishment; but it found little favor in Congress, and nothing was done.

In 1836 we had reached the meridian of our naval power. On the 18th of February of that year the Senate passed a series of resolutions, one of which ran as follows :

> That the President be requested to cause the Senate to be informed of "the probable amount that would be necessary to place the naval defences of the United States upon the footing of strength and respectability which is due to the security and to the welfare of the Union."

The Executive replied that "the force to be prepared ready for use when circumstances may require it should consist of fifteen battle-ships, twenty-five frigates, twenty-five sloops-of-war, twenty-five steamers, and twenty-five small vessels, and that the frames, ordnance, etc., etc., should be prepared for ten battle-ships and ten frigates." It was proposed, further, that six battle-ships, eleven frigates, fifteen sloops-of-war, and a number of smaller vessels should be kept in active service during peace, "for the protection of our commercial interests, and *to prepare officers and others for the efficient management of the force proposed for a state of war.*" The year 1850 was fixed upon as the most remote period at which the proposed force ought to be ready. The board was of the opinion, however, that it might be prepared much sooner, "should Congress deem it advisable to make larger appropriations than those suggested." But Congress did not "deem it advisable"; indeed, did not deem it advisable to make any increase whatever. Six years after making their report, the able staff of the Secretary of the Navy—the navy commissioners—were legislated out of existence, and the year 1850 passed, and 1860 and 1870 and 1880, and now we find ourselves approaching the year 1890, and instead of a "gradual increase," there has been a gradual degeneration of the navy, and we have not to-day a single battle-ship to succeed those launched in 1818-20.

The decline of our naval power cannot be attributed to a radically defective form of naval administration alone, though that is responsible for much of the evil. There is another cause. According to natural laws, the military and mercantile marine of a state rise and fall together. The exception to this law is when a purely military policy compels the maintenance of a war marine; and we are not a people to exercise military previsions,

In the early days of the world's history war-vessels were needed to keep down piracy and enable traders to pursue their way in peace. An extensive commerce begot distant colonies, and both required the constant protection of a war marine. Then a navy came to be an exponent of a nation's wealth and power. The commerce and navy of Tyre grew together, and together fell. Carthage in her days of prosperity monopolized the trade of the Mediterranean, and her navy for a time defied the whole power of Rome. During the middle ages, the Italian Republics, Venice and Genoa, had large interests in commerce and powerful navies. With the loss of the one the other passed away. Spain, Portugal, and Holland, each in its turn, went through the same experience. England presents the greatest example in history of enormous wealth acquired through foreign trade. Colonial possessions followed, and a navy which defies the united forces of any two maritime countries in the world was the natural result.

For a time the United States followed England in her extension of ocean commerce. The American flag became a familiar sight on every sea, and the tonnage engaged in our foreign trade ran up to be second only to that of England. But our foreign shipping had already begun to decline before the breaking-out of the rebellion in 1861. Our people were, and are, content to have their carrying trade borne in foreign bottoms, and to see what was once a source of national pride and strength and power, transferred to foreign flags to help make their countries rich and strong. Having sacrificed a large measure of our shipping interests, and with no outlying possessions to protect, what more natural than that there should be a decline of our naval power? Blind or indifferent to the military aspect of the question, the resultant of the several causes has forced the navy to abandon its principal and time-honored rôle as the offensive arm of the government, thrown it back upon the lines of defence, and gradually withdrawn it from the sea. The tendency of the entire navy now is to get on shore—and stay there.

The "new navy" took its rise in 1881. The very term is suggestive. It is peculiar to this country, and indicates our methods of procedure in all matters connected with naval affairs. In the maritime countries of Europe naval architecture kept pace with the changes that have been going on for years past in naval and military science. Marine architects and their artisans moved with

the times; and the naval officers and seamen had no difficulty in adapting themselves to the continuous, but gradual, changes. These changes were brought about by such slow degrees that there was no precise date to mark the decease of an obsolete type of ship and the birth of a new. It was not so in the United States. On the close of the War of the Rebellion we sat down to rest. What mattered it though we had given the "Monitor" to the nautical world, and a fresh impetus to marine architecture? We ourselves sat down to rest. The building of vessels of war, in which we had once led the navies of the old world, became to us a lost art! and a quarter of a century after the "Monitor" had effected a revolution in the art of naval warfare, we find ourselves compelled to go abroad for the models of our war-ships; meanwhile having our naval constructors educated in foreign schools of naval architecture. The building of the battle-ship "Texas" from English designs marks a distinct era in the history of the United States Navy.

For twenty years from the War of the Rebellion the Executive had been urging the augmentation of the navy with monotonous iteration; but the people, or their representatives in Congress assembled, would not have it. What wonder we should drop from the list of sea powers? The first Advisory Board was instructed to "recommend such vessels as Congress would be ikely to approve"—not what, in the judgment of the Executive, the country ought to have, but what it could get. This was the lesson of generations of experience in naval administration. The board reported, therefore, that, as the limit of money Congress would be willing to appropriate for the navy was, without doubt, a very restricted one, the construction of iron-clads (battle-ships) was not recommended, though "such vessels are absolutely needed for the defences of the country in time of war; and if Congress be willing——" But, as in 1836, Congress was *not* willing. Hence the plan for the new navy was not for a navy at all, but for a sort of *pis aller*.

The new steel cruiser upon which we pride ourselves—and justly so—is designed, as already stated, with a special view to run away from battle-ships. She must be able to escape from iron-clads, and outrun, so as to capture, merchantmen. "If slower than iron-clads, she could not keep the sea; and if slower than merchantmen she might as well remain in port." (Report of the

Secretary of the Navy, December 1, 1888.) This is all very well, but fifty years ago we could have sent to sea a squadron of ten battle-ships that would have compared favorably with those of any nation on the globe, and to-day we have none.

It is true we have the keels of two battle-ships on the stocks, and they may be finished and even sent to sea before the types they represent become obsolete. Even that addition to the navy would avail but little unless they are the forerunners of others. In 1836 the official programme called for fifteen battle-ships. To-day we need twenty at least. When we shall have put one-half that number afloat we may begin to talk about "rehabilitating" our navy without provoking a smile of derision.

But the people, or their representatives in Congress, are not willing to rehabilitate in that sense. Hence the United States Navy of the future is to be made up of coast-defence vessels, which, according to our custom, will be laid up "in ordinary," and thin-sided steel cruisers for the high seas. Consequently the American flag is to be displayed upon the ocean only by vessels designed to prey upon private property, and this notwithstanding our own proposition to amend the rules of international law by exempting private property at sea from capture.

During the Franco-German war in 1871 it was the French battle-ship that dominated the North Sea. The preying upon the private property of the citizens of either belligerent played a wholly insignificant part in the war. And yet that part, insignificant as it is in a maritime war, is the principal objective of the United States Navy of the future. Thus do we virtually abdicate our position as a sea power.

Kinglake, in his "Invasion of the Crimea," draws, with pardonable pride, a fine picture of the moral effect of the presence of an English man-of-war. It was just before the battle of Alma, when, "as though in arrogant, yet quiet assertion of an ascendant beyond dispute, one solitary English ship, watching off the Sebastopol harbor, stood sentry over the enemy's fleet. Men had heard of the dominion of the seas; now they saw it." That "solitary ship" represented the vast, living power of a people ever ready to wield it.

A solitary American steel cruiser, with its delusive prefix of "protected," represents the latent possibilities of a great country placidly awaiting some national disaster to generate its mighty forces.

S. B. Luce.

THE THRONE IN ENGLAND.

BY JUSTIN M'CARTHY, M. P.

"THE throne in danger!" used to be the alarm-cry of all the ancient Tories and other old fogies of a past generation in England. We never now hear a word about the throne being in danger. We have had during the last few years many measures passed into law which ought to have made the bones of the Eldons and Wetherells to turn in their graves. Of course, we have had plenty of talk about revolution and socialism and anarchy and so forth; but, oddly enough, we have heard nothing about the throne being in danger. Now, I have often noticed in political life, both at home and abroad, that the very time when society comfortably settles down to the conviction that some particular institution is certain to last forever is also the very time when prudent friends of the institution would do well to consider seriously whether its future is quite so well assured as society's opinion reports.

Is the throne of England in any immediate danger? it will naturally be asked. So far as I can see, it is in no immediate danger whatever. Nobody threatens it; no popular outcry is raised against it. Indeed, if one were to look only at the surfaces of things, he might be apt to believe that the throne is more firmly fixed in England now than it was some fifteen or sixteen years ago. Then there really did seem to be growing up in this country something like a republican party. Sir Charles Dilke first made himself prominent as one of the leaders, or, at least, one of the heralds, of a republican party. He went round some of the great cities and towns of the north of England and denounced the cost and the parsimony of royalty with much energy; and a series of little riotings was the consequence, which observers on the European continent in some instances mistook for the overture to a revolution. At the same period, and in a debate started by Sir Charles Dilke in the House of Commons, Mr. Auberon Herbert, brother of the Conservative Earl of Car-

narvon, proclaimed himself a republican, and a wild scene of excitement followed, and a great many loyal members of the House seemed to have turned themselves for the moment into bellowing madmen. At that time, too, a little school of writers, some of them men of great capacity and distinction, used to proclaim themselves republicans and to publish articles commending the republican form of government. At great meetings of London workingmen republican principles were openly avowed, and were applauded to the echo that should applaud again. A very shrewd and self-possessed observer from within and not from without told me then that he fully expected to see within a short time an openly-republican party, small, indeed, but intellectual and influential, established in the House of Commons.

Time has gone by and there is no republican party established in the House of Commons ; nor do members of that House now hear a single word said about a republic. I do not quite know what the present opinions of Mr. Auberon Herbert are on the subject; he seems lately to occupy himself with different topics altogether. I do not think it likely that the opinions of Sir Charles Dilke are changed; but he has not for ever so many years said a word in public on the subject. The fact is that the subject has dropped. As Mr. Bright said at the time, the republican question had not really come up in England. It was put forward prematurely and had to be immaturely dropped. We had ever so many pressing matters to occupy us in Parliament and public life generally, and it was found that the republican question had little more than an academic interest, which in politics means no interest at all.

Therefore we hear nothing in England just now of any danger to the throne as an institution. But does that mean that the throne is necessarily to be perpetual ? Nothing of the kind—at least, it does not necessarily mean anything of the kind. It means that nobody thinks the throne an institution which requires to be at once reconsidered or remodelled or abolished. It is no pledge for the permanence of an institution in England that at some given time there is no talk about abolishing it. Take an illustration of this fact. Consider the case of the House of Lords. We hear very little now at public meetings about the reform or the abolition of the House of Lords. Does this mean that the public of England are growing better satisfied with the House of

Lords? Not at all. It only means that the people of England have more pressing work on hand than the reconstruction of the second Parliamentary chamber. Their hands are full just now. Until the Irish question is settled, no other large scheme of reform has the slightest chance of being taken in hand. But everybody knows perfectly well that as soon as the country has time to turn its attention that way the second chamber will be reconstructed. Take, again, the case of the Established Church in England. We do not hear nearly so much said on this subject as we used to hear some years ago. But the churchman would be sanguine indeed who ventured therefore to believe that the church is a permanent institution. Now, I am not comparing the throne of England with the House of Lords or with the Established Church. As regards the House of Lords the comparison would be quite absurd; for no one can doubt that a large proportion of the English people are profoundly convinced of the superiority of the monarchical system and are deeply attached to the throne and the reigning family, while no reasonable being professes to believe that there is a word to be said in favor of the heriditary principle in law-making. The case of the Established Church is a better illustration. Most churchmen are deeply attached to the state church as an institution; many firmly believe that its disestablishment would do great harm to the interests of religion. But I should fancy that there are few really thoughtful and observant Englishmen belonging to the Church of England who do not see that the principle of a state church cannot for very long be maintained in England. But here comes the difference between the church and the throne. A large mass of the population have for years and years proclaimed themselves uncompromisingly hostile to the state-church principle; there is no such open and avowed hostility to the principle of a limited monarchy. My object in bringing forward these illustrations is merely to show that the absence of any organized opposition to an institution, or, indeed, of any unfriendly criticism with regard to it, does not, in English public affairs, furnish any conclusive evidence that the institution is destined to be perpetual.

Let us try to get at some idea of the feeling of various classes in these countries towards the throne. As regards the present sovereign, there can be no doubt that wherever she is known she

is popular. I fully believe that she is, on the whole, the best queen that history has known. As a constitutional sovereign, her conduct has been without praise. In Scotland, where she is well known, she is much loved by the people. In Ireland, of course, she is practically forgotten. The vast mass of the people neither like nor dislike her; they know nothing about her; she never comes into their minds. It could not be otherwise; for, as far as Ireland is concerned, one must admit either that the sovereign has no personal duties toward that country or that the duties have not been discharged. From the royalist point of view this is deeply to be regretted; for the natural tendency of the Irish people is to be devotedly loyal: it must, indeed, have been a persistent neglect that could have so completely extinguished the feeling of loyalty in the Irish people. For myself I am not at all sorry for it. I do not admire that fervor of personal devotion to this, that, and the other sovereign. There seems to me to be something unmanly and unwholesome about it; I think my countrymen are much better without it. However, there is a plain fact to carry in our minds while we are considering this subject—the fact that the vast majority of the people in one of these islands do not feel the slightest interest in the maintenance of the monarchical principle in Great Britain. Of course, I do not venture to say whether this condition of feeling in Ireland might not be greatly changed, say, by the sight of a sovereign going over every year to open a national parliament in Dublin. I am only telling of what actually exists in Irish feeling and the reason for its existence.

How are things in England and in Scotland? Undoubtedly the wealthier classes almost everywhere in England and Scotland are in favor of the monarchical principle. They like royalty and all it surroundings—the effect it has on society, the distinctions it maintains and confers, the social honors which it offers as a prize to wealth. In London, and among the class of people who come up to London for the season, the throne is like the sun; their world would be dark without it. The prime beauty and glory of their lives would have gone out if had they not a Court to go to and to talk about. It is a great day in a girl's life when she gets presented at Court. The Prince and Princess of Wales are personally very popular—he with a very large circle; she with everybody. I never heard any one say a word of the Princess of Wales except in her praise. When I make a certain qualification with

regard to the Prince, it is because there is a section of the older nobility who do not profess quite to admire the way in which the hospitalities of Marlborough House are conducted. They do not find the principle of selection very carefully applied there. They would not much like to be associated with the place and its various companionships. They would rather that the Queen herself were at the head of society in London again, controlling and directing it. All these, however, are, of course, thoroughly loyal to the monarchical principle and to the reigning house. It may, perhaps, be news to some Americans to be told that even still there are among the English nobility a small, a very small, number of men and women who do not go to Court because they cannot in their consciences admit that Victoria is the lawful Queen of England. They are still faithful to the Stuart tradition; although they have not the faintest dream or hope of a Stuart restoration, and are as little likely to trouble the reigning house as the Bench of Bishops are likely to do. But, as one of this small group—I do not know whether they can even be properly called a group—once said to me, "to admit the existence of a fact does not prevent your conscience from judging of it." So they obey their consciences and maintain that there is no real sovereign but a a Sovereign of Divine Right. These men and women do not count for anything in the question we are now considering. I only mention them because I think their position is worthy of notice and, in a certain sense, is highly interesting.

All "society," then, in England is monarchical and is attached to the reigning family. This is perfectly correct as a general statement and will not be seriously affected by the fact that among the aristocracy there is to be found here and there a theoretical republican. Society in England is monarchical; wealth also is monarchical. The London shopkeeper, of the West End at all events, is monarchical and loyal. He depends for much of his living and his success in life upon the Court and the classes who frequent it; and M. Josse was a jeweller, as we all know. Of course, the great land-owners are all monarchical,—and so are most of the new rich men. But the loyalty of the territorial magnate is a tradition, and that of the new rich man is a condition of respectability. In any time of great national convulsion, the territorial magnate and the new rich man would

not count for much. The working classes and the poor will always have to count for much. I do not want to exaggerate the evidences to be found in recent popular movements here of a growing tendency to socialism. But I think the man must be blind who does not see that there are such evidences. The reader will presently see their bearing on the subject of this article.

The main bulwarks of the throne in England are, or I should rather, perhaps, say were, three in number. First and most ancient was the sentiment of loyalty, more or less deeply tinctured with the principle of divine right. Then there came—a sentiment or a conviction of much later birth—the comfortable belief that monarchy was an institution necessary for the stability of a state. The errors and extravagances of the first French Revolution strengthened this idea very much in the minds of Englishmen in a past generation; the doings of the Commune had an effect of a somewhat similar nature at a time nearer to the present. The English *bourgeois* got it into his head that only a monarchy could keep a state stable and prosperous. The feeling of security was the second great sustainer of monarchy in England. The third—the one great sustaining power now—is the quiet love of Englishmen for old-established institutions and their strong dislike to any manner of sudden and violent change. Now, let us consider how these chief securities of the throne have been affected by modern conditions in England. I think it will hardly be disputed that the old-fashioned, chivalric, sentimental feeling of personal loyalty has little or no active existence among English populations just now. We do not profess any longer to worship and adore any royal personage. We do not believe that the king's face gives grace, as the old ballad puts it. We should as soon think of professing to believe in the healing charm of the royal touch for the king's evil. These beliefs and professions were the natural companions of the principle of divine right; and they faded with it. There is no place for them in the practical life of the modern world. An Englishman now feels the highest respect for the monarchy and for the royal family; but it is a respect which has nothing whatever of the romantic in it. Some Englishmen and many more English women adore the Court and the throne and the members of the royal family with the adoration of the snob for rank and the mean hope of the snob that he or she may be allowed to come within the light of their glory. But that feeling is not in the

least like the old-world sentiment of loyalty. The people who cherish this more modern principle of devotion are not people who would be of the slightest use to the throne if the throne were in any danger. The worth of the monarchy to them is the fact that it keeps a Court around it at which it is believed to be a social distinction to be presented; and that it gives opportunity for a Marlborough House, where one may be invited occasionally to a dinner party or a ball; and that there are princes and princesses who may be prevailed upon to honor with their presence one's own dinner party or one's own ball. I leave it to my readers to judge for themselves how far this sort of loyalty could be reckoned on as the cheap defence of an endangered throne.

The second great safeguard of the monarchical system in England has been losing much of its strength. Even the British Philistine now does not believe that a republic means anarchy and confusion, battle, murder, and sudden death. The wild students in Henri Murger's "Bohemia" found that the pavement of a republic wears out one's boots as well as the pavement of a monarchy. The British Philistine is finding out, for his part, that a man may have boots to wear under a republic as well as under a monarchy. He sees that people manage to get on pretty well in the United States and that there is no more fear of a revolution in Wall Street or on Broadway than there is in Threadneedle Street or Pall Mall. The example of the French Republic so far has been reassuring to the ordinary Englishman. He has been able to see that even a French Republic can have its fierce political struggles and partisan rivalries and can get through them without recourse to the bayonets or the barricades. If the French Republic only continues firm and orderly for a few years more, the effect of that example will do a great deal—one can hardly say how much—towards familiarizing the mind of England with the idea that a Republic even in Europe may be just as stable, as orderly, and as strong as a monarchy. This would not precipitate a change of constitutional system here; but it would do much towards preparing the way for it. The English people would begin to ask themselves why they should not work a system which other people can work so well. The monarchical system stripped of the old romantic and poetic associations, and judged strictly with regard to its practical value and virtue, would not show well in comparison with a

republic such as you have in the United States. The English people are, in my opinion, peculiarly well fitted to work a republic. They are, by nature and tendency, orderly and law-abiding. Then the very merits, public and private, of the present Sovereign have tended to make people used to a national life in which the monarch takes little or no part. Because the Queen is faithful to her constitutional duty it has become evident that the Ministry governs; that is, that a majority of the House of Commons governs; that is, that a majority of the people governs; and that the machinery would work on pretty much the same without a sovereign as with one. In a different way, the Queen's devotion to the memory of her lost husband, withdrawing her from society and public life for so many years, has left her little more than a mere name in the mind of the younger generation.

Some of the new conditions of things are tending, therefore, —I do not say to prepare the way for a republic, but to bring about a general willingness to entertain the idea of a republic in these islands. I do not want to go any farther than that; and I know quite well that a sudden failure of the French Republic would have a strong effect in the other direction.

I admit to the full the third great support of the monarchy—the traditional objection of the ordinary Englishman to sudden change of system. I very much doubt whether there are a hundred Englishmen to-day, even among professing republicans, or even among English republican artisans, who would put out a hand for the purpose of abolishing the monarchy merely because they would themselves be pleased if it were abolished. The existence of the monarchy does not occupy much of their thoughts. They look on the Queen as an excellent wife and mother—a character which the English working-man greatly respects; and they believe that the Prince of Wales is "a jolly good fellow." Therefore there is at present no feeling of direct and active hostility to the monarchical institution which could put it in the slightest danger. Therein I am ready to agree with the most devoted upholder of the system of monarchy. But the difference between us is that he is, doubtless, of opinion that this means perpetuity of tenure for the institution, and I am not. But I am quite willing to admit that the monarchy might possibly be allowed to go on forever in England if nothing else were to harm it more than the

mere spread of the belief that a republican system represents a better idea. We do not make revolutions in English constitutional life for ideas. That is not the Englishman's way. Perhaps it proves the superior brightness and activity of the minds of other peoples that they are ready to take no end of trouble to get their political systems into harmony with what they believe to be the best political theories. But so far as the Englishman is concerned, such peoples may "resolute till the cows come home"; they cannot "resolute" him into the Quixote of a political idea.

No one, I think, will complain that I have not taken full account of this great safeguard of the throne in England—the ordinary Englishman's dislike to change. Where, then, is any danger to the throne likely to come from? One very common danger to other thrones can hardly be feared for the throne of England. It is not in the least likely that there will be any difficulties about the succession. Whence is the danger to come? Well, suppose, for example, that we were to have at any time another George the Third—a conscientious, wrong-headed, obstinate man, who would insist on interfering in foreign politics; in overruling his ministers; in directing a foreign policy of his own. It is surely not impossible that such a monarch might come up again in England. Now, let us go on supposing a little more. Let us suppose that the policy of such a sovereign were to involve us in war—in a war which the people generally did not like. Let us suppose that a conscientious and popular minister resigned office rather than carry out the war policy, and knowing that he could not get the King to accept his ideas. Very well, some other minister is found; England goes into a struggle which her people do not like; and suppose that under some conditions of peculiar disadvantage her armies are defeated at first. Does any one believe that the throne would be able to withstand this shock? I certainly do not. The English people are wholly unused to defeat; I mean, of course, the defeat of one of their great armies in a great war. They could bear with patience a little reverse in South Africa, because all the world must know that it was but a mere accident, to be retrieved as soon as they could send out the men to do it. But a defeat of an English army at the hands of the Germans or the Russians—what a ferment of national passion would not that create in England! And if it were known that the policy of the Sovereign had made the war which had opened

with such disaster, is it not quite on the cards that the crown might get knocked off in the convulsion ?

Of course, no such crisis could arise in the life of Queen Victoria. She has always been, as I have said, a thoroughly constitutional sovereign. Several times has there occurred in her reign a crisis where England seemed to be brought quite to the edge of a great war and where it was commonly understood that the sentiments of "the classes" went one way and the sentiments of "the masses" went the other. The Queen was supposed to have her inclinings, like other people; but if she had them then, unlike other people she kept them to herself, and they were not allowed to interfere for one instant with her duty as a constitutional sovereign. If she had been a woman of a different character, she might have found without much difficulty some statesman willing to persuade himself that her views were right and were his views also. The same that is said for the Queen may, I have no doubt, be said for the Prince of Wales. I do not suppose there would be the slightest likelihood of that genial and experienced man of the world attempting to be his own foreign minister, or, indeed, having any relish whatever for the work of such an office. Therefore I can say readily that I do not see any immediate chance of danger to the monarchy from undue and disastrous interference on the part of the sovereign. In any case, the danger would, according to my view of possibilities, be confined to the field of foreign policy. I can hardly imagine an English sovereign now setting himself against the wish of the great majority of the people on any question of domestic policy. Every one understands the domestic policy too well. The nation cannot be plunged blindfold into disastrous domestic legislation. But foreign policy is a totally different thing. The English people have often been led quite unconsciously up to the very verge of a foreign war, into which they never could have been plunged with their eyes open. Then at the moment of crisis it is so easy to get up a cry that the flag of England has been insulted and that the national honor requires to be vindicated. An interfering, headstrong sovereign and a pliant minister would have little trouble between them in so managing things as to make the people of England believe for the moment that the war, which was the fruit of the king's and the minister's own policy, was forced on them by the aggressive policy of a foreign state. Then suppose a late

awakening, disillusion, disappointment, defeat, disaster; and the war has still to be carried on; victory has to be struggled for at any risk, and struggled for unsuccessfully again and again,—and in the meantime what? Would the fall of the ministry, would even the impeachment of the ministry, satisfy the national idea? I, for one, do not think it would. Impeachment is obsolete in England. Popular revolution is never obsolete.

I do not attach much or, indeed, any importance to the fact that vast crowds of Londoners turn out to see any public performance in which any member of the royal family takes a part. The ordinary every-day life of the humble Londoner is so dull and barren that he is delighted at any opportunity of staring at anything. A company or two of infantry passing along Buckingham Palace Road will be followed for a mile by an excited crowd of gazers. The Lord Mayor's show on the ninth of November paralyzes all the traffic of that part of London through which it passes. The streets are literally blocked up by a crowd that stretches for miles; every window along the line of procession is alive with faces; extemporized rows of benches and seats are erected in the thoroughfares everywhere; the very roofs of the houses are covered with spectators. What does all this mean? Does it mean that the people of London are devoted to the Lord Mayor and are ready to lay down their lives in defence of the aldermen and the Common Council? Nothing of the kind. Outside certain official circles, nobody in London cares three straws for the Lord Mayor or would have the slightest objection to his institution being submerged in the new County Council for London, over which Lord Rosebery presides. To a vast population, not merely in England, but even in London itself, the sovereign is only as another Lord Mayor—a sight to be stared at on some rare occasion. The institution of royalty has no concern with their daily lives; it is not made by them or for them; it would not make the slightest difference to them if it were to be abolished to-morrow. They have no sentimental feeling of any kind about it. I do not believe that with the majority of such people there is any active feeling of dislike to it; I think there is no feeling either way. I am speaking now of what I may call the inert mass of the population.

But I am inclined to think that among the radical artisans in the great towns there is a good deal of dissatisfaction

and discontent smouldering rather than burning. Such men grumble very much now and then at the cost of royalty; at the number of German princes and princesses quartered on the country; at the successive demands for marriage portions for this, that, and the other member of the royal family. There is much of the Socialist spirit spreading through the great towns, where the contrast between growing wealth on one side and growing poverty on the other is forced upon the attention of hard-working, ill-paid, ill-fed men and women. It is perfectly true that, if all the money voted annually to all the various members of the royal family were distributed among the poor of England, the national distress would not be sensibly alleviated. But hungry people do not argue in that way. They only see that enormous sums of money are yearly paid to a certain family, and they ask what that particular family is doing to earn the money. In London, at all events, the newspapers in by far the largest circulation among the poor are the radical Sunday papers, which are always attacking and denouncing the manner in which public money is lavished on the royal family. Take a very different sort of paper read by a very different class; I mean my friend Mr. Labouchère's *Truth*. *Truth* is high-priced; it lies on drawing-room tables and club tables; it is not read by the poor; it is a "society" paper altogether. Yet it is constantly showing up the cost of royalty, the sham offices created to gratify royalty's relatives and friends, the waste of public money on royalty's empty palaces and disused parks. Society, as I have said, is decidedly loyal; yet it reads and perhaps quietly chuckles over Mr. Labouchère's remarks, all the same.

The sum of all this as it shows itself to me may be put in a few lines. The glamour of the throne in England is gone. The dread of republican institutions is gone also. The vast majority of the population care nothing about royalty. There is nothing to hold on to, if from any cause royalty were to make itself unpopular in England at the time of some great national crisis. It is, at least, not impossible that we may one day have a bad king in this country; and in that case it seems to me that a complete change of system would be a more natural and probable event than a mere change in the succession.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY.

OUR IGNORANCE OF ALASKA.

BY KATE FIELD.

AMERICAN citizens, living comfortably on the Atlantic seaboard, knowing their own wants and dictating terms to their submissive representatives, take little heed of those new additions to the United States which are destined to be the crowning glory of the Republic. When a nation is so big as to render portions of it a *terra incognita* to those who make the laws, there's something rotten this side of Denmark!

Congressional ignorance of the Pacific Slope, alas! is no new story. Why should pigmies realize what giants failed to know? When Daniel Webster towered in the Senate, he crushed under foot a proposition to establish a mail route between Independence, Missouri, and the mouth of the Columbia River, some 3,000 miles across plains and mountains. After generally denouncing the measure, Webster exclaimed:

"What do we want with this vast, worthless area? this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts or those endless mountain ranges, impenetrable, and covered to their very base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast, a coast of 3,000 miles, rock-bound, cheerless, uninviting, and not a harbor on it? What use have we for this country?"

What use, indeed, have we for Kansas and Colorado and Montana and Oregon and Washington Territory and California, and that wonderful rock-bound coast "with not a harbor on it"? Shade of Massachusetts' great Senator, look down upon San Diego and the Golden Gate, gaze upon land-locked Puget Sound with its thousand miles of harbor, and blush—if shades can blush—at your old mortal blindness!

The march of Empire goes on in spite of human fallibility, and now the land of the midnight sun knocks at the door of Congress. She is twenty-three years old and asks to be treated as

though she were of age. The big-wigs at Washington rub their eyes, put on their spectacles, and wonder what this Hyperborean hubbub means? What does "an Indian country"—as Attorney-General Williams called it—want?

Said a citizen of Alaska to Miss Scidmore not long ago: "If those Senators and Congressmen don't know any more about the tariff and the other things they help to discuss than they do about Alaska, the Lord help the rest of the United States! Their ignorance of the commonest facts of geography would disgrace any little Siwash at Fort Wrangel school. What have they paid for all these special government reports for, if they don't ever read them when they get ready to speak on a foreign subject, to say nothing of what can be found in the encyclopædias and geographies?"

"Alaska is good for everything," exclaimed Seward twenty years ago. "Alaska is good for nothing," retorted General Thomas. A Congressional committee, on reporting the bill for its purchase, sneeringly referred to "that latest and most questionable of National real-estate speculations," while the Press pointed with derision to that "tag-end of creation," "our new possession of Walrussia"!

General McDowell, never visiting Alaska and therefore unbiassed by personal knowledge, declared that, if no purchaser could be found, our government would be wise to give away "Walrussia" "to some country that would fulfill the Russian treaty obligations." General McDowell evidently sympathized with a relative of Lord Aberdeen who, coming from England, years ago, to inspect the Pacific coast, became greatly enraged because salmon would not rise to a fly, and reported that "the whole country was not worth a damn!" This intelligent envoy, as well as General McDowell, might have listened with amazement had they been present in the Dominion Parliament when, in 1878, the Honorable Mr. Bunster, with more foresight than our own countrymen, told a different tale.

"Honorable gentlemen might laugh, but looking at the matter from a national point of view, he fully meant what he said from his knowledge of the country, that the territory of Alaska possessed a more genial climate than Ottawa, notwithstanding its latitude, while its natural resources and capabilities were more valuable than people had any idea of. When honorable members of this house sneered at Alaska, he had a right to speak from his own personal knowledge, and tell them that they were mistaken; and the day was not far distant when, from the geographical position of this country, they would see the force of his remarks on this subject. The

lease of Alaska was more than enough to pay one million dollars annually. It was the best investment the United States had ever made."

A cent an acre ought to be a good investment. What other portion of the United States has cost as little ?

General McDowell's advice was not taken. Fortunately, Alaska was not given away. It has only been thrown away—so far as development is concerned. First came a military occupation, a few troops being sent to Sitka, the capital, on Baranof Island ; to Wrangel, Tongas, and St. Paul. With the purchase of Alaska, Sitka became transformed. The town that once held a thousand Russians, a governor and his staff, a bishop with his train of priests, was deserted save by Indians and a few hundred Creoles and half-breeds, who from that day to this have remained in complete ignorance of the government to which they owe allegiance. San Francisco is the only town in the United States of which the majority ever heard.

In 1869 the Aleuts sent the following petition to Washington :

"We beg respectfully of the United States Government, and of our fellow-citizens all over the Republic, to regard us not as Indians,—we are not such,—but as fellow-citizens, struggling to advance in civilization, and to become worthy to be esteemed as fellow-citizens of the Republic."

The simple people of the Aleutian Islands appealed in vain.

Not very long after (August 20, 1870) General Jeff. C. Davis, commanding the Department of Alaska, reported to the Secretary of War that

"the natives of Alaska are peaceful, honest, and capable of transacting ordinary business quite well, and would doubtless improve themselves if they had a fair chance, but their present complete enslavement and robbery by an unscrupulous ring of speculators will ever prevent such progress."

Ten years of no government and military occupation brought to Sitka and the Alexander Archipelago rum and ruin—nothing more.

The year 1794 saw the first vessel built and launched in Alaskan waters. It left the primitive stocks inspired by Governor Baranof, and was christened "The Phœnix." In 1878 Sitka could no more have built a ship than it could have built the Pyramids. Everything had gone to decay. Both mind and matter were mildewed, and Sitka's only wharf was so out of repair, owing to being eaten by that mischievous marine, the *teredo navalis*, that it would have tumbled into the water had not $39.40, collected by the army as a wharf fund, been expended in repairs. To-day that same wharf is so dilapidated as to be almost use-

less. Passengers from the steamers are generally landed from a tug. The primitive plough-shares formerly sold to the indolent rancheros of California and Mexico were manufactured at Sitka's shipyard, as were axes, spades, hatchets, and hoes. The bells of the Pacific coast missions, many still in existence, were cast at the Sitka foundry. The knell of that Russian foundry was tolled long ago.

After the withdrawal of the military, Alaska was left without any government whatever, save the occasional presence of a revenue cutter, whereupon Gouverneur Morris, special agent, made such representations as should have received attention but did not.

"The policy of the government towards Alaska," wrote Mr. Morris, "has been a disgrace. Instead of encouraging emigration and a development of the resources of the country, enterprise has been discouraged." "There is no law," he continued, "for the recordation of conveyances. A man cannot sell a piece of property and give a deed for it which will be legal notice to third parties."

Under such conditions, of course, no land could be mortgaged.

"A man may be murdered in Alaska, his will forged, and his estate scattered to the four corners of the earth, and there is no power in a court of chancery to redress it."

Thoroughly desperate at the lack of government in the Territory, Deputy-Collector J. C. Dennis, stationed at Fort Wrangel, wrote June 15, 1878, to Collector Morris, asking to be relieved:

"I take this step on account of the manner in which the department is running this Territory."

"I have acted in the capacity of arbitrator, adjudicator, and peace-maker until forbearance has ceased to be a virtue. Within the past month one thousand complaints by Indians have been laid before me for settlement, and as I am neither Indian agent nor justice of the peace, I decline the honor of patching up Indian troubles for any time longer than can be obviated."

"Again, the prospect for Congress to extend law and order over this country looks gloomy, and in the absence of law at this port, no compensation that the government could offer me would be any inducement for me to act in the capacity of deputy collector another year."

The only recommendation the Secretary of the Treasury made to the Forty-fifth Congress in behalf of neglected Alaska was that the port of Sitka should be abolished! This document is well worth reading.

"Since the withdrawal of the troops from Alaska last Spring, the management of the Territory has practically devolved upon the Treasury Department. The only officers who could exercise any authority were the collector of customs at Sitka and his deputies stationed at other points within the Territory, the duties of the officers at the Seal Islands being confined exclusively to the protection of the seal interests. It was feared that the sudden withdrawal of the troops might result in a

conflict between the whites and the Indians; but thus far little disturbance has occurred. The white population at Sitka is very limited, and the expense of maintaining customs officers there and at other points within the Territory has aggregated, within the past two years, $17,418.32, while the receipts from customs have, during the same period, been very much less. It is, therefore, recommended that the port of Sitka be abolished."

"Here's wisdom for you—chunks of it," as Jack Bunsby would remark. Gouverneur Morris truly rejoined that the Alaskan district was not one of revenue, but of protection. If trade had fallen off since the days of the tyrant Czar, whose fault was it? With such reasoning as the honorable Secretary's, would not many a postal route be abandoned? And the Secretary, after stating that the only officers in Alaska who could exercise authority were the collector of customs and his deputies, virtually recommended their dismissal!

Such was the criminal inaction of the Government which contented itself with drawing $317,000 annually from two small seal islands, leaving the rest of the country to fate. Nor were the people much enlightened by the literary pabulum prepared by experts.

"And so," wrote H. W. Elliott in 1877, "we took Alaska ten years ago, just as a big boy takes a strange toy, full of great satisfaction, and fired with the intense desire to investigate its inner workings, and, like the boy, we have made the examination, and we have laid the toy aside. How we pitied the ignorance of our Russian friends, who declared, in response to our call for information regarding its natural resources, that they had been so engrossed in the one idea of getting furs, that they really 'did not know of anything else'; and after ten seasons of careful inquiry we find, too, that we to-day don't know of anything else."

"However, though we have lost the wild apples of Sitka, and have failed to see the shimmer of golden fields of corn at Kodiak, yet we have much to please and far more to interest us in Alaska. It is a paradise for the naturalist, a happy hunting-ground for the ethnologist, a new and boundless field for the geologist, and the physical phenomena of its climate are something wonderful to contemplate. It is, and will be for years to come, a perfect treasure-trove for these gentlemen; but alas! it bids fair, from what we now know, never to be a treasure-trove for the miner or the agriculturist."

"Never" is so long a word as to make me wonder at its use by intelligence. That "never" employed by Mr. Elliott is certainly embarrassing when Juneau, a town of 1,000 inhabitants, is almost entirely populated by miners, and 150 miners are wintering (1887) in the valley of the Yukon, with the prospect of being joined in the spring by 500 more.

"If gold or silver is discovered in Alaska," predicts Mr. Elliott, "it must be of unusual richness or it will never support any considerable body of men up there, so far away from the sources of necessary supply. The reputed Alaska gold mines are not in Alaska at all, but on the Stikine River in British Columbia, being over 180 miles to the eastward of the boundary between the two districts; but as the Stikine River, to reach the Pacific with its rapid flood, has to pass through thirty miles of

Alaskan soil and rock, so the miners visit Alaska in this way only, as they go up and down the river from Cassiar to Victoria, the Sound, and California every spring."

Strange that Mr. Elliott should have so emphatically committed himself in 1877 when gold was discovered near Sitka in 1871 by a soldier named Doyle! It is unfortunate, too, for this gentleman that the most successful mine to-day in Alaska is "The Treadwell," the grade of which is exceedingly low, but which can be profitably worked on account of the facility in getting at it! What is true of "The Treadwell" will be more or less true of many other mines on Douglas Island, which is becoming an extended mining-camp. Nicholas Haley, of Sitka, was almost simultaneous with Doyle in finding gold, and he, as well as other Sitkans, expresses profound faith in the mineral richness of the neighboring islands.

Alaska is the land of topsy-turvy. Heretofore, placer mines have always been found in the beds of streams and in valleys. In Alaska they have been found on the top of a mountain one thousand feet high, as well as in the valley of the Yukon. Indians report gold in the mountain passes of the Chilkat River, while its color has been found near the mouth. The latest discovery of gold quartz is on the island of Unga.

The precious metals, however, are not Alaska's sole mining attractions. Coal and iron abound on the Chilkat River. In fact, there are evidences of coal on many parts of the coast, but only two mines are at present in operation, one being in the Arctic at Cape Lisburn. Years ago Professor Davidson, of the Coast Survey, discovered coal, which pervades an entire range of hills, the very dust of which adheres to the magnet. These hills extend thirty miles along the east bank of the Chilkat River. That there is copper in Alaska no observer can doubt. One hundred years ago Captain Dixon wrote of large circular wreaths of copper, both at Norfolk Sound (now Sitka) and Queen Charlotte's Islands, twisted into that shape by the natives themselves, who wore them as ornaments about their necks. Copper River is so called because of the metal found there that resembles the copper of Lake Superior. The Thlinkets possessed the art of forging this copper long before the advent of Europeans. Nor is lead an unknown quantity, while sulphur, galena, graphite, platina, marble, and cinnabar are known to exist. Petroleum has been discovered at Katenay on the main land opposite Kodiak Island.

In agriculture Alaska is not promising, but the country is by no means as impossible in this respect as it has been represented. "There is not an acre of grain in the whole territory," wrote Whymper. Because there was no grain grown it by no means follows that grain cannot be grown in certain localities. Hundreds of acres of land near Wrangel can be drained and cultivated. The Indians on the neighboring islands raise tons of potatoes and turnips for their own consumption. Butter made for me by the Scotch housekeeper of Wrangel mission was a sweet boon, and proved that cows were a success in that region, and that dairies were a mere question of time.

Let us return to Mr. Elliott's prophecies of ten years ago.

"Several 'patriots' living on Puget Sound and in Oregon have been urging some legislation by Congress which would result in creating a few offices up there, but they have met with deserved failure thus far. . . . Though we know now that Alaska will never be, in all human probability, the land for us, yet we have one great comfort in its contemplation, for we shall never be obliged to maintain costly mail routes or appoint the ubiquitous postmaster there. We shall never be asked by its people for a Territorial form of government with its attendant Federal expenses, and much as the coast looms up on the map, we shall never have to provide light-houses for its vacant harbors."

More "Nevers"! Five years after these predictions (1882) a few postal routes were established and "the ubiquitous postmaster" invaded Alaska. In 1883 Senator Harrison introduced a bill to provide a civil government for Alaska. Amended, it passed both houses and was signed by the President in May, 1884. Now the Territory has a governor, a district judge, a district attorney, a marshal, four deputy marshals, and four commissioners.

The bill of 1883 called for the enforcement of the laws of Oregon when applicable. As Oregon, however, is an inland State, and as Alaska, so far as settled, happens to be entirely seaboard, the laws do not properly apply. No land laws were passed, but it was conceded that Indians or other persons should not be disturbed in the possession of any lands actually in their use or occupation or then claimed by them. The mining laws of the United States were adopted. Here at least was a gain. Criminals, too, were no longer taken to Oregon for trial, at great waste of time, money, and patience. Verily, we are a most economical nation! We begrudge the establishment of a collector of customs at Sitka on account of a deficit in the revenue, and send criminals fifteen hundred miles in search of justice!

The Governor is instructed to report upon the entire territory to the Interior Department, but as there is no steamer at his command, how can the Governor who is stationed at Sitka know of what is beyond the route of ordinary travel? The distance between Sitka and Unalaska, the seat of a colony and the home of a commissioner, is 1,200 miles. There is no steam communication with this continent save by the occasional vessels of the Alaska Fur Company. Those who need to avail themselves of the district court at Sitka must go first to San Francisco, and return by the same circuitous route, journeying nearly 8,000 miles instead of 2,400!

Any one wishing to visit the Kodiak district or the Aleutian Islands must hire or buy a vessel for the purpose. There is a mail service from San Francisco to Tahiti, another to the Fiji Islands, and one is proposed to the Samoan Islands; yet the Alaska districts, which may easily be made ten-fold more valuable than all the islands of the South Pacific, are outlawed. The Aleutian Islands have no mail service whatever, and the Sitkan Archipelago is only allowed a semi-monthly mail. The United States Treasury, overflowing with gold and silver, cannot afford to be even decently just to pioneers whose long night of six months needs to be cheered by news from their old homes.

"Much as the coast looms up on the map,"—and it looms to the extent of 25,000 miles,—Mr. Elliott can still triumphantly maintain that there is not a single light-house in the whole district. The Russians had a light in the castle at Sitka that was seen ten miles at sea.

No survey was made up to June 30, 1878, and now but one Government vessel is employed in this important work, the appropriation by Congress for the entire coast survey being so small as to leave but $5,000 for Alaskan waters. At present speed, it will require two more years to complete the survey of the course taken by pleasure-steamers. The next generation may record the completion of Alaska's entire coast survey. This is a fact, though, twenty years ago, almost the last words of Charles Sumner's address on Alaska pleaded for an immediate survey of its indented coast, to bring it all within the domain of science and assure to navigation much-needed assistance!

"We have learned enough of the country and climate by this time," continues Mr. Elliott," to know that the lands and fishing waters now occupied by the natives of Alaska will never be objects for the cupidity of our people."

Once more "never!" and already land occupied by natives is appropriated by the invading Caucasian, while the fishing waters, leaving out the burning question of the fur-seal monopoly, are attracting the attention of Atlantic fishermen with a view to colonizing. Why not, when the North Pacific teems with life? Why not, when in Alaskan waters are found seventy-five species of food fish, sixty of which can be put upon civilized breakfast- and dinner-tables? Why not, when the whale, sea-otter, fur-seal, hair-seal, walrus, salmon, cod, halibut, herring make Alaska one of the richest fisheries in the world?

"Indeed, what I have seen," said W. H. Seward at Sitka in 1869, "has almost made me a convert to the theory of some naturalists, that the waters of the globe are filled with stores for the sustenance of animal life surpassing the available productions of the land."

Salmon canneries already exist, and yearly become more numerous. At Killisnoo, five hundred barrels of herring are sometimes caught in a single haul of the seine, each barrel yielding about three gallons of oil. Three hundred thousand gallons of this oil are shipped yearly from this small port.

Then we hear, first, that there are no forests worthy of the name in Alaska; secondly, that though trees grow on the south-eastern coast and also border the rivers, their timber is worthless.

"If ever we utilize the spruce and fir timber on the Sitka Coast," argues Mr. Elliott, "we must encourage and foster the effort in the line of ship-building, for this timber is too gummy and resinous for the ordinary use of house-building and furniture-making."

Having once been an Alaskan industry, ship-building can be so again, for coal, iron, and lumber are next-door neighbors; meanwhile saw-mills multiply, and I have seen very big trees turned into material for house-building. Certainly red and yellow cedar, hemlock, white spruce, alder, and balsam-fir abound in the Sitkan Archipelago. La Perouse refers to "those superb pines fit for the masts of our largest vessels," and Belcher describes "a very fine-grained, bright yellow cypress, . . . which, besides being used in boats, was exported to the Sandwich Islands in return especially for Chinese goods." The most valuable timber is this yellow cedar, which often attains a height of one hundred feet. Professor Davidson says that trees have been found near Sitka one hundred and seventy-five feet high. Of the quality of the wood there are two opinions. Some wise men say it is too

wet for enduring use, while others enthusiastically proclaim our Arctic province to be the great reserve lumber region of the world. At the lowest estimate, the supply of timber is reckoned at 57,000,000 feet, covering 300,000,000 acres. William H. Seward committed himself unreservedly on this point.

"I venture to predict that the North Pacific coast will become a common shipyard for the American continent, and speedily for the whole world. Europe, Asia, Africa, and even the Atlantic American States have either exhausted or are exhausting their native supplies of timber and lumber. Their last and only resort must be to the North Pacific."

We need not, however, look for a realization of this prophecy until the axe is no longer heard on Puget Sound.

That incorruptible patriot, Charles Sumner, builded even better than he knew when, in 1867, he aided the Secretary of State by delivering an exhaustive speech, which undoubtedly converted Congress to the wisdom of purchasing Alaska. Yet Mr. Elliott, strangely enough, does not hesitate to denounce that admirable *résumé* of facts and possibilities—as valuable to-day as it was twenty years ago. Says Mr. Elliott:

"The great speech of Sumner in favor of the treaty, and which, in the universal ignorance of the subject prevailing in the American mind at the time it was delivered, was hailed as a masterly and truthful presentation of the case, is, in fact, as rich a burlesque upon the country as was Proctor Knott's 'Duluth.' Sumner, however, meant well, but he was easily deceived by the cunning advocates of the purchase. No; no mention was made of these islands [Pribylov] and their fur-seal millions, but infinite stress was laid upon the commerce which would spring up," etc.

To label this exhaustive speech "a burlesque" is the worst possible criticism on the critic's own intelligence. To assert that no mention is made of the Pribylov Islands and "their fur-seal millions" is mere quibbling. Sumner does not actually name the islands, but, as he discusses "furs" at length, states that "the seal has always supplied the largest multitude of furs to the Russian Company," and gives the number of skins in detail that have been sold from time to time by this company, referring on one occasion to "an inexplicable absence of seal skins," Mr. Elliott is certainly indebted to his spleen for his "burlesque." "Amid all the concealment or obscurity which prevails with regard to the revenues of the company," adds Sumner, "it is easy to see that for some time there must be a large amount of valuable furs on this coast." Then he advocates preserving the seals by killing only a specified number yearly, under which economy the supply will vastly increase, as has been the case.

If Sumner, who "meant well," *was* "easily deceived by the cunning advocates of the purchase," on whom falls this accusation of deception? On the citizens of the Pacific coast.

"They were the first to ask for this enlargement of boundary, and will be the first to profit by it," says Sumner. "While others knew the Russian possessions only on the map, they knew them practically in their resources. While others were still indifferent, they were planning how to appropriate Russian peltries and fisheries. This is attested by the resolutions of the Legislature of Washington Territory; also by the exertions at different times of two Senators from California, who, differing in political sentiments and in party relations, *took the initial steps which ended in this treaty.*"

It is barely possible that one, if not both, of these Senators took no pains to enlighten Charles Sumner on the special value of the islands of St. Paul and St. George as seal-rookeries. There may have been method in their silence. Perhaps it was to the interest of certain individuals anxious to obtain a monopoly of the seal-trade, to keep it as much as possible in the background. Perhaps, too, it was merely a coincidence that one of these Senators, John F. Miller, became a member of the Alaska Commercial Company soon after Russian America was transferred to the United States. That Sumner, at the time of his speech, had no idea of the formation of this company is shown by his comments. "It remains to be seen," he says, "into whose hands the commerce [meaning furs] on the Pacific side will fall, now that the whole region will be open to the unchecked enterprise of our citizens."

Sufficient proof has been given, I think, that Sumner more than mentions those wonderful seals which to-day form a most interesting, as well as the largest, part of Alaska's population. That he lays "infinite stress upon the commerce that would spring up" is not true, if by "commerce" is meant trading outside of peltries, fisheries, mines, and lumber. Sumner pictures Alaska's resources as known in 1867, and but lightly dwells on the mines, which are a recent development. But when Sumner refers to the fisheries as "the most important of all" Alaskan products, is he not more of a prophet than his critics?

"What even are sea-otter skins," he asks, "by the side of that product of the sea, incalculable in amount, which contributes to the sustenance of the human family?" The sea-otter has almost disappeared; the seal will be exterminated if promiscuously slaughtered, as is probable when the present or a similar monopoly of the Pribylov Islands ceases; but on forever go the

salmon and cod and halibut and herring, this last "one of those natural products whose use has decided the destiny of nations." Sumner sees Alaska supplying not only the Pacific States and Central and South America with fish, but also China and Japan. "It does not seem impossible for an energetic and commercial people to find a market here of inconceivable magnitude which will dwarf the original fur-trade with China, that was once so tempting." Possible? It is more than probable. Already there is a vision of Sumner's prediction, when "the beautiful bidarka will give way to the fishing-smack, the clipper, and the steamer. All things will be changed in form and proportion, but the original aptitude for the sea will remain; a practical race of intrepid navigators will swarm the coast, ready for any enterprise of business or patriotism. Commerce will find new arms; the country new defenders; the National flag new hands to bear it aloft." The statesman who advocated the purchase of Russian America, who named this "great land" Alaska, who so clearly foretold its history, can sleep peacefully while narrow souls attack his memory.

The "government" of Alaska, though better than ever before, is ridiculous, anomalous, unjust, and fraudulent. The territory has been acquired under false pretences, as can be shown by the third article of the treaty with Russia.

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within three years; but if they should prefer to remain in the ceded territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion."

What are the "rights, advantages, and immunities" of American citizens? This question is best answered by quoting Sumner for the last time. Addressing Congress, he says:

"Your best work and most important endowment will be the republican government which, looking to a long future, you will organize with schools free to all, and with equal laws, before which every citizen will stand erect in the consciousness of manhood. Here will be a motive power without which coal itself will be insufficient. Here will be a source of wealth more inexhaustible than any fisheries. Bestow such a government, and you will bestow what is better than all you can receive, whether quintals of fish, sands of gold, choicest fur, or most beautiful ivory."

Congress has bestowed nothing of this sort. Two generations have grown up in crass ignorance. Schools have been conspicuous by their absence, and no man can stand erect upon the bit of land that should be his, because there are no land-laws.

Indignantly protesting, the Hon. J. G. Swan, of Port Townsend, Washington Territory, exclaims:

"The country is not Indian country. It is ours by right of purchase from Russia. We obtained the fee-simple to the whole of Alaska by that purchase, and there is not one word in the whole of that treaty which reserved any right of joint ownership to either Indians or any other people. If the Government desires to open up Alaska to settlement, the same inducements should be offered as were held out in early days to settlers in Oregon and Washington Territory."

Like the dog in the manger, Congress will do nothing for Alaska, nor will it permit Alaska to do anything for herself locally, or at Washington through a delegate. Yet, in 1890, two islands of this despised and neglected province will have paid into the United States Treasury $6,340,000—within one million of Alaska's entire purchase!

It is estimated, on good authority, that Alaska now sends out yearly double the wealth brought in, her industries for 1887 being valued as follows:

Fur trade	$2,500,000
Gold (entire product)	1,350,000
Fisheries	3,000,000
Lumber and walrus ivory	100,000
Total	$6,950,000

Ivan Petrov, special government agent, states that Alaska,

" with its savage population of over 30,000, represents a larger volume of trade than any other portion of the United States inhabited by uncivilized tribes, even without reference to such mineral wealth as has been or may be developed within its limits, or to the net revenue derived by the Government above all its expenditure for Alaska from the lease of the fur-seal reservation."

This is the country that General McDowell would have given away; that Congress can barely discover on the map!

"What, Mr. Seward, do you consider the most important measure of your political career?" asked a friend.

"The purchase of Alaska; but it will take the people a generation to find it out."

The people have not yet found it out. Patience, long-suffering Alaska!

KATE FIELD.

THE NEGRO INTELLECT.

BY WILLIAM MATHEWS, LL.D.

AMONG the modes of solving the Southern problem, one in which many persons at the North have put faith has been a hoped-for division of the white vote at the South. It has been thought that if the Southern people could be ranged in opposing political parties, according to their varying views of political, economic, or moral questions, the political rights of the freedmen, which are now practically abridged, might be exercised in full. To this solution of the problem several leading men of the South have announced themselves as invincibly opposed. In a speech made on October 27, 1888, in Dallas, Texas, Mr. Henry W. Grady, editor of the Atlanta (Ga.) *Constitution*, declared that such a division of the white voters would be the worst thing that, in his opinion, could happen.

"The clear and unmistakable domination of the white race—dominating not through purchased alliance, but through the integrity of its own vote—that is the hope and assurance of the South. . . . Ignorance may struggle to enlightenment; out of corruption may come the incorruptible; but the supremacy of the white race of the South must be maintained *forever*. . . . *Let no man tinker with the work of the Almighty*. . . . No race has risen, or will rise, above its ordained place. Here is the pivotal fact of this great matter: two races are made equal in law, and in political rights, *between whom the caste of race has set an impassable gulf*."

This sentiment the *Constitution* calls, with exquisite but unconscious irony, "the spirit of democracy, pure and simple, in this region." Like views are expressed in a letter to *Harper's Weekly* by Mr. A. B. Williams, editor of a Democratic paper in Greenville, South Carolina, and by Mr. C. J. C. Puckette, a Texas politician.

The pith of their opinions is that ours is "a white man's government," and that the colored race, in spite of the rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution, have no place at the South except that which was the doom of the Gibeonites of old—of being "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for their late

masters. Note that it is not urged that the white race should rule so long as it is greatly superior in intelligence, character, and property, but that, as Mr. Grady says in another part of his speech, it "must dominate *forever.*" No hint or hope is expressed of a possible distant time when, by education and training, the negro may become qualified to share in the work and responsibility of business, professional, and political life ; but he must be robbed by perpetual white domination of all motives for self-improvement, till he shall have become so cowed, abject, and spiritless that he will cease to aspire to a higher condition or to dream of rising to influence through a capacity for performing the higher work of society. By the holders of such views the necessary and permanent intellectual inferiority of the negro is assumed, not because he lacks opportunities of self-improvement, but because, as they doubtless believe, he is naturally and hopelessly incapable of high culture. Of all the arguments used by the slave-holders and their apologists before the late war to justify the oppression of the blacks, and now used to excuse the perpetuating of white rule in another form, none has been urged more pertinaciously than this. Irrelevant as it is in either case, we purpose to show that it is baseless in fact. Granting the present inferiority of the negro, we affirm that it has never been proved; nor is there any good reason to suppose that he is doomed forever to maintain his present relative position, or that he is inferior to the white man in any other sense than as some white races are inferior to others.

On the threshold of all argumentation designed to show the negro's radical inferiority we used, in former days, to be pointed to his anatomical structure. Look, it was said, at his physical peculiarities, the shape of his skull, the projection of his jaws, his high cheek-bones, his broad flat foot with prehensile great toe and "lark heel," his short woolly hair and thick epidermis,—features which mostly indicate closer relationship to the chimpanzee than to the white man. But as it is admitted or implied in all the controversies concerning the negro to-day that he is a *man,* however low in the scale of humanity, we shall make no attempt to maintain the truth which Paul proclaimed on Mars Hill before the race-bigoted Athenians, that "God had made of *one blood* all nations of men to dwell upon the face of the earth." It is to the comparative mental weakness, to the asserted indo-

lence and servility, the degradation and vices, of the negro, that we are pointed as reasons why he should be ruled by the white man. A thousand facts, however, show that the defects and faults of the negro belong to his *habits* rather than to his *nature;* are owing, not to his physical or mental constitution, but to the grievous hardships to which he has been exposed and the obstacles everywhere thrown in the way of his advancement.

Dr. David Livingstone, in speaking of "the status of the Africans among the nations of the earth," says: "We have seen nothing to justify the notion that they are of a different 'breed' or 'species' from the most civilized. The African is a man with every attribute of human kind." Foreign culture, which has penetrated in a moderate degree some regions of Africa, has been shut out from others by almost impenetrable barriers. Beyond these the aboriginal people remain secluded amid their mountains and forests in a state of instinctive existence—a state from which, as Prichard observes in his "Physical History of Mankind," human races "have hardly emerged, until moved by some impulse from without." Travellers who have visited the interior of Africa testify that in regions where the influence of the slave-trade has not been felt, in the fertile countries beyond the Sahara, the negroes' disposition is mild, gentle, and amiable; that, far from lacking ingenuity, they have adopted many of the arts of civilized peoples; that they have formed themselves into political societies; that their disposition to labor is as strong as that of white tribes similarly situated; that, in short, they manifest the same anxiety to improve their condition, the same desire to advance in knowledge and virtue, that distinguish the human species in all the rest of the globe. The negroes of this part of Africa dwell in towns of considerable extent, many of which are said to contain ten and even thirty thousand inhabitants,—a circumstance which implies a considerable advancement in industry and the resources of subsistence. The fact that in these regions the population once consisted of savages as wild and fierce as the natives farther south, shows that human society on that continent has not been everywhere stationary and unprogressive from age to age.

"The first impulse to civilization," says Prichard, "was late in reaching the interior of Africa, owing to local circumstances which are easily understood; but when it had once taken place, an improvement resulted which is, perhaps, proportional to the early progress of human culture in other more favored regions of the world."

But "no race has risen, or will rise," says Mr. Grady, "above its ordained place." Yes, but who shall say of any race, till it has had a fair trial, till it has had opportunities and incentives for self-improvement, what *is* its ordained place? What was the apparently "ordained place" of the Germans in the first centuries of the Christian era—the savages who, without cities, letters, arts, or money, consumed in sleeping, gluttony, debauchery, and gambling the days and nights that were not spent in fighting, often staking their personal liberty on their games of chance; whose drunken assemblies were often stained by the blood of friends and relatives; who adored the sun and moon, the fire and the earth, and propitiated their imaginary deities by the sacrifice of human victims? How much more hopeful than that of the Southern colored man to-day was the mental and moral condition of the Anglo-Saxon *villein* in the time of Henry II., when he was as absolutely dependent upon the will of the lord, and as incapable of holding any property, as the American negro before his emancipation? The lord claimed possession of the *villein* and of all that could belong to him, as he would have claimed possession of a horse or any other quadruped properly his own. Macaulay tells us that, when one of the ablest Normans attempted to win the hearts of his English subjects by espousing an English princess, his barons were shocked by the degradation. By many of them it was regarded as a marriage between a white planter and a quadroon would now be regarded in Virginia. Known in history by the honorable name of Beauclerc, he was called by his own countrymen by a Saxon nickname, in contemptuous allusion to his Saxon connection. The same historian tells us that in the time of Richard I. the ordinary imprecation of a Norman was, "May I be an Englishman!" His ordinary form of indignant denial was, "Do you take me for an Englishman?"

Again, we ask what was, to all appearance, the "ordained place" of the Russians during the century between Ivan Vasilyevitsch, the first Czar, and Peter the Great? Hardly two centuries have elapsed since Russia was covered with hordes of barbarians, among whom it would have been as difficult to discover any examples of intellectual cultivation and refinement as at this day to find the same phenomena at Timbuctoo or among the negroes of Georgia or Alabama. Even Peter himself, in spite of his efforts to civilize his subjects, showed by the frightful punish-

ments he employed—by the hangings, beheadings, and breakings upon the wheel, in which he personally took part—that his own civilization was but skin-deep. European in dress, he continued a barbarian in mind, manners, tastes, and his mode of governing. Such was the condition of a country which is now one of the six great civilized nations of Europe; and the sneerers at negro improvement, who prate of the thickness of his skull and despise the effect of circumstances on character, would have been as much justified in dooming the Russians to everlasting barbarism from an inspection of the Calmuck skull as they now are in dooming Africa to the same fate on account of the head, the color, and the wool of its inhabitants. Again, what student of history needs to be told of the contempt with which the feudal barons looked upon their serfs, whom they regarded and treated as an inferior race of beings?

The facts we have cited show that the intellectual and moral chasm which separates almost every nation of Europe from its remote ancestors is fully as great as that which separates the negro to-day from many a nation of whites. They show, too, how absurd it is to measure his mental capability, or that of any other semi-savage man, till his intellect has been developed as fully as possible by culture. Intellectual effort—effort through many generations—and contact with superior races are conditions precedent to the elevation of any uncivilized people. Even the humblest skilled artisan in any community is not an accidental product; his mental and moral nature has been slowly evolved through ages of effort. Just as the ancestors of the English or the French people could not suddenly emerge from barbarism into the many-sided development of their nineteenth-century descendants, so we cannot reasonably expect that the ignorant and degraded negroes of the South will be able, in two or three generations, to reach the standard of Europeans. As well might we expect a crab, in the year of its transplantation into a garden, to bear the sweetest fruit, as to hope by the education of a barbarian taken from his wild, or of a serf emancipated from bondage, to render him all at once equal to an educated American. But, as "with time and patience the mulberry leaf becomes satin," so the negro may be converted into a cultivated and polished citizen.

"Nemo adeo ferus est ut non mitescere possit,
Si modo culturæ patientem commodet aurem."

The truth is, there is no standard by which we can gauge the mental power of a man whose life has been passed amid influences adverse to intellectual development. Thus far, the last twenty-five years excepted, we have seen the negro only when insulated by the deserts of Africa from all communication with civilized peoples, or groaning under the yoke of bondage; yet, when we compare the American negro with the native African, we find that even the most debasing and brutalizing form of servitude—the pitiless drudgery of the field and whip—has not prevented the former from improving by his intercourse with the whites. On this point we quote with pleasure the words of "a Southern Democrat," in the *Century* for January, 1885:

> "The negroes came to this country barbarians. They were savages; but they were not savages when freedom found them out. On the contrary, it may be said that in the history of the world there has never before been an instance where a race of people only two hundred and fifty years removed from a condition of abject barbarism was so closely related to civilization as were the negroes of the South when they were made free."

Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that the Southern freedman stands to-day higher in knowledge and culture than did our ancestors in the days of Christ, or even five hundred years afterward. How grossly untrue, then, is the assertion of Montgomery Blair that the negro's nature, of which, he says, the despotic form of government is the outgrowth, "is not changed by transplanting, more than that of the orange or the banana"! How absurd to talk of the efforts made to uplift the freedman from his degradation, and thus to raise him to a plane of political and social equality with the white man, as "tinkering with the work of the Almighty"! Such tinkerers were Augustine and Boniface, the apostles of England and Germany, Clarkson, Wilberforce, and all the self-sacrificing philanthropists the world has seen. We may exaggerate the psychical and intellectual, as well as the physical, differences between particular races of men as we please; but "the fact that they are really insignificant is destined," as Max Buchner says, "to be made more plain the more the subject is impartially studied; and the efforts of certain men, learned in distinctions of types, to set up fixed marks of separation between them, will not succeed."

But why argue the question *à priori* when facts may be cited in abundance to show that the mocked and branded negro needs but an equal chance with his more fortunate white brother to

make great, if not equal, strides in civilization? The struggle in Hayti which immortalized the name of Toussaint, of itself, fully tested and established the capacity of his race for self-government. It demolished the barrier of prejudice and caste by placing almost at a single leap a down-trodden and divided race upon a level with the best forms of Caucasian humanity; and this, too, not in the persons of a few anomalies, giants among the dwarfs, but by dozens and scores of brave soldiers, sagacious organizers, and even thinkers and writers. When we see negroes, as in St. Domingo, organizing immense armies, planning campaigns and sieges which, if not scientific, at least triumph to a considerable extent over the science and bravery of the finest troops of Europe; when we see men of this race arranging forms of government, executing to a considerable extent some of the most difficult of human enterprises, entering into commercial relations with foreign powers, acquiring a maritime force and navigating vessels in the tropical seas with all the skill and dexterity which that difficult operation demands,—is it not time to set bounds to that presumptuous arrogance which would arrogate to our own race the rights and privileges of the species? Facts like these and the lives of many eminent individuals of the race prove that there is nothing in the physical or moral constitution of the negro which renders him less susceptible of improvement, under favorable circumstances, than other men.

The race which produced Benjamin Banneker, the self-educated mathematician and astronomer, whose abilities elicited the praises of Jefferson and Condorcet; which produced that accomplished scholar, linguist, and reasoner, Edward W. Blyden, LL.D., president of Liberia College; which produced that prodigy of mathematical genius, Thomas Fuller, "the Virginia Calculator," who was torn from his native land and sold into slavery at the age of fourteen; which produced in the eighteenth century Dr. James Derham, the slave who, after earning his freedom, became one of the most eminent physicians in New Orleans, and won commendation for his skill from Dr. Rush, of Philadelphia; which produced the heroic Crispus Attucks, whom Boston has lately honored with a monument; William Crafts, the African explorer; Robert Small, whose exploit in Charleston harbor is well known; Frederick Douglass, whose extraordinary abilities, natural and acquired, many of our best-educated white men might envy;

George W. Williams, author of an elaborate and able history of the negro race in America—a work of prodigious labor; Richard T. Greener, for several years dean of the Law Department of Howard University; Edmonia Lewis, the sculptor, who has wrought many fine works of art; and the negro scholar who some years ago obtained a double-first at the University of Toronto,—*this* race has demonstrated, beyond all reasonable doubt, its right to dwell on a plane of equality with any other with which its lot is cast. But why speak of these exceptional colored men only? Do we not see all about us, in every large town, men of the same race who make bargains, execute commissions, accumulate property, and judge of politics as acutely and sagaciously as most white men? Have not many of the colored men shown ability as fluent and able public debaters? and has not the Southern white man on the floor of Congress, as Wendell Phillips observed some years ago in this REVIEW, more than once quailed before negro logic, sarcasm, and power of retort?

That the elevation of the mass of freedmen must be slow is obvious. How could it be otherwise? When we consider the long, dark night of barbarous ignorance in which the negro lived in his native land, followed by over two centuries and a half of servitude here, in which it was a crime to teach him and he was treated so as to stunt the natural growth of his reason and his virtues, how can we expect him at once to overleap the gulf that yawns between him and his late master? We are too apt to forget that the freedman has no heritage of trained and disciplined mind coming to him through generations of educated ancestors. We forget that he has necessarily little of that power of self-control, that capacity for sacrificing present ease to future good, into which, by thousands of years of discipline, the impulsive, improvident nature of the European savage has been slowly and painfully evolved. We forget, too, that many means of mental and moral culture which are open to other men are denied to him; that libraries, reading-rooms, lectures, concerts, churches, and religious associations, frequented by them, are either closed altogether to him or open under odious and insulting restrictions. Who can say how many colored men who have started, full of enthusiasm, upon the road of self-improvement have thus, as a Southern observer has said, been "forced back into the bog of ignorance and degradation from which they are so eager to escape"?

In spite, however, of these facts, so unpleasant to the impatient philanthropist, there is no occasion for a pessimistic view of the situation. The sable cloud has a silver lining. Though mentally inferior to the white man, the freedman is compensated not a little by three traits which are strongly marked—docility, affection, and the religious instinct. Then, again, the conditions of his existence are infinitely more favorable to his civilization than those in which the Anglo-Saxon, German, or Slavic barbarians were placed. The garnered experiences, the hoarded wisdom, the treasured discoveries and inventions of ages are ready to be poured into his lap. The success which has thus far attended the efforts made to educate him has surpassed expectation. It shows that, even in his present debased condition, resulting from centuries of barbarism and bondage, he is susceptible of even high culture. In 1871 the commissioners appointed by the State of Georgia attended the annual examination at Atlanta University. In their report, signed by ex-Governor J. E. Brown, they declare that at every step of the examination they were impressed with the fallacy of the popular idea (which, in common with thousands of other men, a majority of them had previously entertained) that the members of the African race were not capable of a high grade of intellectual culture.

"The rigid tests to which the classes in algebra and geometry and in Latin and Greek were subjected, unequivocally demonstrated that, under judicious training and with persevering study, there are many members of th e African race who can attain a high grade of intellectual culture. They prove that they can master intricate problems in mathematics and fully comprehend the construction of difficult passages in the classics."

It is a pity that John C. Calhoun is not living to read this report. The Rev. Alexander Crummell, a negro who was educated in England at the University of Cambridge, because American colleges were all closed against him, said recently, at the Episcopal Church Congress in Philadelphia, that when a boy he heard that arch-defender of slavery declare: "If I could find a negro that knows Greek syntax, I would then believe that he is a human being, and should be treated as such." The newspaper reporter of this adds that, if the great statesman were living to-day, he might see more than this—even a negro who has written a Greek Grammar. At Oberlin College, the class rolls show the scholarship of the black students to be fully equal to that of the white.

In September last a convention of the colored Baptists of the West and Northwest was held in Nashville, Tennessee. An intelligent white gentleman who attended the sessions says, in a letter to the Chicago *Standard*, that they were generally fine specimens of physical manhood, well dressed, and that their addresses were well written.

"In most cases a line of thought was chosen, and maintained with orderly progress from point to point. The relation of each part to the end chosen was clear, with little digression, little introduction of inappropriate material. . . . Occasionally one hears a passage of genuine eloquence. . . . . The enunciation in every case was perfectly distinct, the modulation natural, the emphasis appropriate. . . . In their extemporaneous addresses and discussions they were easy and graceful in manner, perfect in self-mastery, never at a loss for thought or word."

The writer adds that the racial instinct was vividly manifested in the speeches, though without ill-feeling toward the whites. "'The black man to the front' was the only phrase frequently repeated. Sensitiveness to the stigma of inferiority was obtrusively apparent." Thinking that this characterization might be unconsciously a little rose-colored, we have interviewed an intelligent Boston clergyman, who visited the convention, and who assures us that the picture has not been overdrawn. "Of course," he adds, "these delegates were the picked men of the colored Baptists." He confirms, too, the statement of the *Standard* correspondent that the white men of Nashville who attended the meetings of the convention confessed that their estimate of the capabilities of the colored race had been greatly heightened. The leading daily paper of that city expressed the same sentiment. Facts like these speak trumpet-tongued regarding the capacity of the colored men for culture and citizenship, and all the arguments in the brains of a thousand metaphysicians cannot explain them away.

If there is any moral quality the growth of which is made impossible by hopeless bondage, it is courage. Yet even in this quality, in which his deficiency, if not utter lack, would be likely to be most conspicuous, the negro showed himself, in each of our wars, to be far from lacking. In the battle of Bunker Hill; in that of Rhode Island, in which a negro regiment repelled three desperate onslaughts of the Hessians; in the naval battles on the northern lakes, where Commodore Perry said that the negroes "seemed to be absolutely insensible to danger"; in the fearful fights before Forts Hudson and Wagner, at Olustee, at Petersburg, and on many other hotly-contested and bloody fields during

our Civil War the colored man proved himself to be, not, as many persons predicted, "as valiant as the wrathful dove or most magnanimous mouse," but the peer in fiery valor of his white antagonist. In some respects the blacks in the Northern armies showed themselves superior to the whites,—as in their freedom from drunkenness (the bane of the white soldier), in aptness for drill and docility in discipline,—and they have even rivalled the whites in enthusiasm, dash, and soldierly pride. The courage of the Ashantee and the Boer is well known. In an article on "The Negro as a Soldier," in the *Fortnightly Review* for January, 1889, General Viscount Wolseley says of the British negro regiments in the Egyptian army that "they are certainly the best fighting material in it. Curiously enough also, even in the old Egyptian army, which fought against us at Tel-el-Kebir, the black regiments were certainly the most plucky."

The conduct of the negro both during and after our Civil War speaks loudly for his mental and moral virtues. At the beginning of hostilities, prophecies were abundant that he would rise at the first opportunity and repeat the horrors of St. Domingo. When Jefferson thought of the negro's wrongs, and remembered that God is just, he trembled for his country. Longfellow, looking forward to the long-impending struggle, could see in the slave only an instrument of vengeance and a cause of ruin.

> "There is a poor blind Sampson in the land,
> Shorn of his strength, and bound in bars of steel,
> Who may, in some grim revel, raise his hand,
> And shake the pillars of the common weal,
> Till the great temple of our liberties
> A shapeless mass of wreck and ruin lies."

But what was the negro's conduct when the hour of grim revel came? To the astonishment of his friends as well as of his enemies, in spite of his provocations, deepening through years, his opportunities for and temptations to revenge, he abstained from wreaking vengeance on his oppressors. During four long years of intense anxiety, of fiery trial and severe privation, he toiled to support the wives and children of the men who were fighting to rivet his chains forever, and never once laid the weight of a finger upon them in insult or injury. The negro raised his hand, not to shake in pieces, but to uphold, the temple of American liberty, though to him it had been a mockery—a prison in which he had

experienced only insult and wrong. What, again, was the negro's conduct when the war was ended and his freedom secured? Once more all the predictions of his detractors were falsified; all the hopes of his "fanatical" friends were more than fulfilled. History furnishes no parallel to the wisdom and good sense, the self-control and moderation, exhibited by those who were suddenly changed from chattels into human beings.

Look at the economic progress of the freedmen, their advancement in material wealth and prosperity, and say if they have not manifested a self-denial, forethought, and thrift which would be creditable to a white race with similar antecedents. Were they utterly disgusted with labor, associated as it is in their minds with the crack of the overseer's whip, with the compulsion and degradation of slavery, who could be surprised? Yet, instead of folding their arms in idleness, as was confidently prophesied by those who assert that the negroes hate work and toil only under the lash, they are earning and saving money, acquiring property, becoming owners of real estate and comfortable homes. They are "establishing family names, and learning the importance of social standing, and of intelligence and good character as its prerequisites." During the brief existence of the ill-starred Freedman's Bank, the colored men are said to have deposited in it (besides what they entrusted to other banks) $57,000,000. When it failed, there were 62,000 open accounts. The cotton crop, instead of diminishing through the freedman's fancied antipathy to labor, has increased by millions of bales. That of 1888–9 is expected to exceed all its predecessors—to reach the enormous amount of 7,500,000 bales! The croakers who predicted that, deprived of the "benign care" of their former owners, the colored race would die out, are now alarmed by the prodigious multiplication of the blacks! Let the freedman continue to surprise us with such mental and moral marvels as we have named for two or three generations more, and who but the most pessimistic negrophobist can doubt that the skeptics who dogmatize about his "ordained place" of inferiority, and the "impassable gulf" that separates him from the white man, will be as hard to find as are now the croakers who denounced Grant as a butcher and the late war as a failure?

WILLIAM MATHEWS.

A PLAGUE OF OFFICE-SEEKING.

BY GENERAL CHARLES H. T. COLLIS.

"FLESH and blood cannot long stand the strain to which we subject our President and Cabinet every four years."

This was the concluding paragraph of a letter I received a month ago from the most distinguished American now living, and was intended to express his contempt for the growing and unseemly demand made upon the time, the patience, and the health of the Executive by the personal appeals of the office-seekers and their influential friends.

Those who have visited the White House since the 4th of March must have been pained, if not humiliated, at the spectacle of all kinds of people from all sorts of places dinging into the Chief Magistrate's ears the merits, and sometimes the demerits, of candidates, sincerely laboring under the impression that the dispensing of patronage is the chief, if not the only, function of his office, and going away with as little appreciation of the courtesy received as though they had paid a dollar at an intelligence office and "left their characters behind them."

A little while ago I stood in the President's room with forty or fifty others similarly privileged, while at least twice as many more were waiting for a chance at him in an adjoining room. Mr. Blaine was anxious to present Mr. Whitelaw Reid, who desired to bid the President farewell, previous to his departure for Paris; Senator Hawley was looking for a chance to introduce a distinguished Englishman; General N. P. Banks wanted simply to pay his respects; Henry Cabot Lodge was restlessly pacing the room looking at his watch, and a distinguished Senator from the Pacific slope told me he wanted to speak to the President about the discrimination of the inter-State bill in favor of foreign corporations; yet during the time these gentlemen were waiting,

a delegation of citizens were recommending their candidate, who was present, for the postmastership of a town which had, perhaps, barely risen to the dignity of a place in the gazetteer.

I heard the President say, apparently in self-defence and as though courteously to end the conference, "Really this is a matter for the Postmaster General," to which came the ready and premeditated response:

"We have seen Mr. Wanamaker, and we are sure he will make the appointment if you ask him to."

This is, I presume, a fair sample of what happens every day. I confess I had a little axe with me, myself; but after what I saw I had not the temerity to submit it to very severe friction, and brought it home with me with its edge about as dull as when I took it there.

Across the street to the State Department, and I ran into a similar collection: little knots of delegations dadoed the four walls of the Secretary's room. Mr. Blaine, who had just returned from the White House, asked me to be seated, as he desired to speak to me when at leisure, and then started on a tour around the room, listening in turn to each group, occasionally making a memorandum at his desk, once or twice signing papers brought to him by his clerk, answering some visitors "according to their folly," and some "*not* according to their folly," until he had sent every one away happy, some of them, doubtless, to the nearest telegraph office to announce to their friends at home that they had "a sure thing."

It must be an immense relief to these gentlemen that there is a droll side to their busy lives. Here were a couple of ladies who were, perhaps, a part of the household of some recently-appointed consul, or perhaps they were applicants for European passports, who talked in such holy horror of the ocean that I at once located them in the far interior. At all events, they insisted upon having the Secretary's views upon seasickness, and as to which was the safest line of steamers. How I envied him the possession of that excruciating urbanity which led him to advise them "to take a very large ship, because the larger the ship was the more water she would draw, and therefore the less motion of the vessel"; and when he found his terms too technical (for, of course, they didn't know a pump from a keel), it was lovely to hear him explain what he meant by the "amount of water she would draw."

General Tracy's hours for receiving had expired when I called; nevertheless he kindly insisted upon my coming in, and I found him discussing both his lunch and a contract at the same time. After disposing of his two engineers and the greater part of his meal, we had a brief chat, during which he confessed that, owing to the demands upon his time from those who desired his assistance, this was the first opportunity he had had either to eat or to transact business; yet he looks like a man used to hard work at all kinds of hours, and thoroughly resigned to submit to the custom in vogue without complaint.

The next morning I dropped in to Mr. Secretary Windom's room. That *was* a sight! Perhaps some of you know that it is one of the largest apartments in the Treasury building. Well, it was not only full, but it had a "surplus"; and all these were candidates and their friends. Are there really custom-houses enough to go 'round? The Secretary stood at his table at the far end of the room, one foot resting upon his chair,—already, perhaps, fatigued, for it was now noon,—receiving each individual and party in turn, and occasionally making a note of what they had to recommend. The tide was still at the flood when I left the room, and I went away wondering where and at what hour of the day or night he attended to the momentous affairs of his department, or whether he was compelled to entrust them to subordinates, while he performed the higher duty of receiving the American people.

Now, Mr. Postmaster-General Wanamaker, whether by accident or design, has his desk in a very *small* room. It holds comfortably about six. If a seventh man came in, I should consider him rude; yet the exigencies of the public service are such, and the demand for new talent in the department is considered so urgent by those who "gave all their time and money for the Republican party," that there were five or six rude people present, besides myself. A Senator from New York, ever on the alert to take care of those who "have done the State some service," had Mr. Wanamaker all to himself at the front window, and his smile of satisfaction as he departed brought a pang of envy to many a throbbing heart whose ordeal was yet to come.

Mr. Wanamaker, I imagine, suffers less physical fatigue, and permits his department to suffer less, through the exactions of the public than any other member of the Cabinet. He is a young

man and his habits of life enable him to get through with a great deal of routine matter before the pressure arrives; besides which he has a quick, yet cordial, method of getting rid of one, to make room for another. *His* "flesh and blood" will not be likely to succumb to the "strain" complained of by my illustrious correspondent.

The fact is that at least three-fourths of the President's and the Cabinet's time is occupied in listening to appeals for office; add to this the hours they would consume if they read one-tenth of the letters and petitions upon the same subject, and what is there left for the proper performance of the duties incident to their respective offices? The President of the United States is, perhaps, the only man in the world who has absolutely no privacy; even his garden in the rear of his residence is a public park open to everybody; he is not secure against the place-hunter in the public street; and I know personally that he and his predecessors have been importuned for favors while trying to enjoy a little rest at the homes of their friends. Is all this the fault of our institutions, our democratic notions, our bad manners? Or is it brought about by a too liberal disposition upon the part of the Executive to be considered of and from and one of the people at all times? Perhaps all these causes contribute. But it is an evil—an admitted, growing evil. The President himself would not deny it; no truthful citizen of either party would gainsay it.

Very true, this is an extraordinary epoch in our political history. When the Democratic party went out in 1861 and Mr. Lincoln came in, the patriotic impulse to enlist, and the opportunities afforded to obtain commissions in the army and navy, relieved him of a multitude of those victors to whom belonged the spoils; and for a quarter of a century Mr. Lincoln's successors, finding the offices already filled by Republicans, had comparatively an easy time of it; but General Harrison succeeds a Democratic Administration with twice as many offices as existed under Mr. Buchanan, with a party at his back clamorous for the places now filled by the opposition, and with no outlet such as helped Mr. Lincoln out of his dilemma.

Yet there must be some remedy for all this. Is the President simply to grin and bear this daily, monotonous, wearing-out process, which I venture to say makes little or no impression upon him touching the office in question, and in nineteen cases out of

twenty is of no possible service to the candidate himself? Is not the President at fault in tolerating so liberally the custom of personal importunity, in this—that he is perpetuating a system which will make the lives of his successors a greater burden to them than his life is to him? A President is apt to believe that the whole country holds him responsible for a faulty appointment. I do not believe it. Partisan journals may talk so, but their ravings are at best ephemeral; the thinking American people know better. Admitting, however, that this is so, who are more to blame for the attaching of this responsibility than the Presidents themselves, who administer the executive office in this respect as it is administered nowhere else on the planet, and as it would be ruinous to administer it in any great corporation?

Imagine Beaconsfield, or Salisbury, or Gladstone compelled to stand at a desk in Downing Street and listen to the appeals of rival factions from Newcastle-upon-Tyne touching the appointment of an inspector of coal mines! Imagine Mr. Roberts, or Mr. Depew, or Mr. Pullman fixing four hours every day during which he would receive applicants for employment and their friends! What a relief this would be to the general manager or superintendent, who, when "a good man went wrong," could boast, "I don't know the fellow; he was appointed by the president of the company." It would be otherwise, however, if the head of the bureau had been clothed with the appointing power, for then the president could say to him, "Unless this man's endorsement *assured* his fitness, he should not have been appointed"; and one such admonition would have secured the future against a recurrence.

The sympathy of the people can always be relied upon by a President who cares for his own comfort so that he may the better equip himself to care for theirs; and as but a small percentage of them are candidates for office, the larger body will, one of these days, *demand* that all his precious time, and perhaps his life, shall not be given to the few. The desire to avoid mistakes, which in the Presidential office is an uppermost thought, as it ought to be in all official relations of life, is apt to create an oppressive burden, the very weight of which may make him stumble, and the pain and embarrassment of this misstep may cripple him irreparably. These tumbles, unfortunately, illustrate the lives of too many of our Presidents. Their blunders are remembered,

while the great things they did for the advancement of the Nation find no place in history outside the musty archives of the State Department.

There is no reason in the world, for instance, why the President of the United States should go bail for a postmaster. The people do not demand it; his constitutional obligations do not require it; his oath of office covers no statutory mandate that he should select the public functionaries himself: on the contrary, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate" gives him a a crucible in which all appointments suggested by his Cabinet may be tested, and experience proves that this process generally separates the dross from the pure metal.

Let the President announce that the custom of personal application to the Executive, excepting at the suggestion of the head of the department having jurisdiction of the subject, will be considered "more honored in the breach than the observance," and he will not only have taken a long stride in the right direction, but the people will applaud him. Cabinet officers can then say: "When this subject comes up, I will lay your testimonials before the President, but you will do your cause an injury if you see him in advance." Senators and Congressmen can say to their constituents: "I shall be notified when this place is to be filled, and will be on hand to ask your appointment; but don't go near the President or Secretary in the meantime, unless you want to put your cause in jeopardy."

The notion that the American people claim the right to be brought in contact with the President whenever they so desire, and that it is his duty to receive them, is a mistake. Their education has been in that direction, it is true, but they have an inherent love of fair play, and they believe the President to be as much entitled to rest, comfort, and privacy as any other man. They would feel happier if he and his constitutional advisers would formulate some plan which would enable them so to relieve themselves of this pernicious pressure as to devote more time to the public weal. They will ratify any remedy initiated by those who alone can suggest it. Who will bring it about? Will it be the President himself, or will his political family insist upon his being relieved? *Nous verrons.*

Let it not be forgotten that the President of the United States is the only head of a nation who could not relieve himself of the

burdens of office. A king can abdicate;—a President cannot even resign, for there is no constitutional body to which he could tender his resignation. He is bound to stick!

To-day the President, if he had fun enough left in him after his weary day's labor, might liken himself to a graphophone out of repair. He is talked to, and talked to, and talked to, all day long; but the next morning, if he turned the crank, he wouldn't understand a consecutive sentence of the confused babble. Therefore I say, "*Cui bono?*"

Let not these words of my friend General Sherman become prophetic: "Flesh and blood cannot long stand the strain to which we subject our President and Cabinet every four years"!

CHARLES H. T. COLLIS.

TRIBUTES TO ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

BY W. W. ASTOR, EDWARDS PIERREPONT, GENERAL W. T. SHERMAN, AND LLOYD BRYCE.

It is a dozen years since my acquaintance with Allen Rice ripened to a friendship whose memory, now that I have the sadness to look upon it as a thing ended, will be one of the most interesting and charming recollections of my life.

When I first met him, fifteen years ago, as an Oxford graduate, his active temperament, his intellectual tastes, and his high ambition marked him for a serious career. An exquisite refinement of manner, an unselfish disposition, a marked originality of thought, and a rare persuasiveness and force and grace of expression made him at once a general favorite. His resolve at this time—and doubtless it proved the most fruitful determination of his life—was to make a name for himself by an earnest devotion to a lofty and useful purpose. He selected the congenial path of letters in preference to other and, perhaps, more conspicuous pursuits for which his talents fitted him equally well. The taste for literary exercise grew upon him, till from a habit, it became his ruling passion. He found in the ceaseless industry of his editorial task both labor and recreation; and so broad were his views and so generous was his ideal that his aim, as he often said, was to make The Review an arena wherein any man having something valuable to say could be heard. He identified himself with his work, and the development which his studies and correspondence brought, indirectly, to himself was reflected a hundred-fold in the success and celebrity he achieved for the magazine with which his name is associated, and which remains a lasting memorial to him in the literature of the time.

The multiplicity of his associations gave him an infinite variety of sparkling conversation, through which—for all his

gentle and kindly traits—would strike a keen sarcasm upon the affectations and shams he detested. So active and vigorous an existence could not pass without differences and strifes; but, intimately as I knew Mr. Rice, and often as he talked with me of his emulations, I never heard from him an ungenerous word of those with whom he stood at variance. Even in the Congressional canvass in which the treachery of one or two hirelings defeated him, he thought less of the ill conduct of the men than of this shameful evidence of party corruption. And far from regretting so disagreeable an experience in politics, he frequently expressed himself glad that the opportunity had been given him to contribute, as he subsequently did, towards a better sense of duty, by bringing a salutary lesson upon the offenders.

Of all my memories of days with Mr. Rice, the pleasantest is the remembrance of an excursion we made on horseback along the Hudson to Albany. It was in May two years ago, and during the five days our journey lasted the magnificent scenery seemed more beautiful than ever before. As we rode, we talked of many things; of men, and books, and life abroad, and the habits and ways of olden times, and often of the landscapes that opened —the glistening river, the distant, dreamy hills, the odorous woods that filled the air with fragrance. Mr. Rice's exquisite sense of humor, his happy disposition, and his enjoyment of life made him a rare companion, and as we discussed the political reforms in which he took an ardent interest, or chatted of stirring and marvellous papers to be obtained for THE REVIEW, or laughed at some droll anecdote with the merriment of schoolboys, the stolid countrymen would now and then cast an astonished glance after us, wondering, perhaps, as did the innkeepers where we rested, that men seemingly able to pay for a wagon should willingly fatigue themselves in the saddle.

I last spoke with Mr. Rice three days before his death. He was then suffering acutely, but talked with good cheer of his intended departure for St. Petersburg, and, above all, of THE REVIEW, whose management during his absence had been continually in his thoughts. He referred also to the current public news, for in illness, as in health, his thoughts sought the inspiration of the touch of living subjects, and of the occupations and activities of the day.

His was a mind stored with graceful images. He had read

deeply in the exhaustless volume of human nature; he was an accomplished linguist, a man of society, and qualified, in point of tact and *savoir faire*, for far more serious diplomatic service than that ordinarily imposed by the American Government. He enjoyed the pleasures of the table, but only for their social and convivial relaxation, for he was of singularly abstemious habit. He had travelled the wide world over, and learned the infinite beauty of Earth: he loved the deep groves, and the poetic solitude of forest paths, and the music of the rustling tree-tops, and the radiant sunshine, and flowers, and the thrilling songs of birds. His course ended when the career laid out in early manhood had reached an extraordinary success and had been crowned with distinction. At the very climax of his life, and at the time of its greatest promise, he attained the brilliant heights that proved for him the portals of Eternity.

It comes with the shock of a fresh sorrow to think that his bright face, that in death looked so handsome and so little changed, has passed from among us. And for me, as for others, it was the saddest moment of many days when, after the funeral, the coffin was closed, and we left it garlanded, and wreathed, and covered with the flowers that pleased him in life. Dear friend, farewell! but not, in God's mercy, forever:—

> "Hereafter, in a better world than this,
> I shall desire more love and knowledge of you."

WILLIAM WALDORF ASTOR.

MY intimate relations with the late lamented Allen Thorndike Rice were of comparatively recent date. Within the past year he has often been at my house, and I have frequently seen him elsewhere.

At the Centennial Banquet he was seated at my side and we had much conversation about his anticipated diplomatic life in Russia, and he called soon after to see me again. From his sick chamber I received a note on the 15th of May, saying that he hoped to sail for Europe in ten days. I was just leaving town; and the day after, at my country house on the Hudson, I received the shocking notice that he was dead.

When we remember that he was not thirty-six years old; that he was educated abroad, graduated at Oxford in 1875, and en-

tered the Columbia Law-School in New York soon after; that a year later—at the age of twenty-two—he bought THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW and assumed the editorship, and was greeted by the journals of the day as "a conceited youth of foreign education and foppish ways, who would rattle round for a while in the chair of James Russell Lowell"; that in a few years he brought up the circulation of THE NORTH AMERICAN from about twelve hundred to a phenomenal number; that in 1879 he organized the expedition which, under the favor of the United States and France, was despatched to investigate the remains of ancient civilization in Mexico and Central America; that in 1884 he bought the controlling interest in *Le Matin*, one of the chief journals in Paris; that he was actively interested in politics, and in 1886 ran for Congress; that he earnestly engaged in "ballot reform," edited "Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln," and contributed to "Ancient Cities of the New World"; edited and managed THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW (which appeared every month), besides being largely in social life; and that he reached the high honor of being appointed from the Great Republic Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Russian Empire before the age of thirty-six,—we must concede to him matchless industry, immense energy, large ability, and strong traits of character.

* * * * * * *

He had in a large degree what has generally been found fatal to success in the great game of ambitious life. He started in this bewildering city, with no father or mother or wise relative to guide him, young, handsome, at once a favorite in society, brilliant, and rich. But when I came to know him I saw that his own head was his guide, that no allurements of social life or of fleeting pleasures could divert him from his ambitious plans. He believed in his high destiny, but that it could only be reached by ceaseless labors and untiring zeal. He was largely gifted in many ways. His memory was remarkable. His perceptions were as lightning. He was inclined to an intensity of mental action which sometimes brought depression and inaction. He was greatly liked by those of kindred intellect and had many devoted friends. He was a brave and liberal man, who opened the pages of his journal to the free discussions of all public questions. His temperament was abnormally restless and intense, and sometimes

drove his busy brain almost to madness and hastened his early death.

Peace to his untimely ashes! After a short life's fitful fever may he sleep well!

EDWARDS PIERREPONT.

I FEEL every disposition to say and do everything to manifest my respect and affection for Allen Thorndike Rice, who died so suddenly and so unexpectedly last week. But I do not feel equal to the task of preparing anything worthy of publication in this connection. My first acquaintance with him began about four years ago, on paper. But since I came to New York this acquaintance has ripened into stronger feelings of love and mutual respect. We have met frequently at his own most hospitable board, at the dinners of mutual friends, and at my own quarters. He was so handsome, so gracious, and so intelligent that from the beginning he grew in my estimation, and I was among the first to hail his entry upon diplomatic life when he was appointed to the first-class mission to Russia.

In his case we realize the truth that whom the gods love die young, for he was only thirty-six years old, yet by his intellectual efforts had gained a reputation and standing among his countrymen which is usually reached only after a long life devoted to public affairs.

Please construe me as a mourner at his untimely death rather than a eulogist of his brilliant and manly qualities.

W. T. SHERMAN.

MAY 22, 1889.

[BY CABLE FROM PARIS.]

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE knew how to say "No." "When I was a child," he used to observe, "my mother would often stand me on a chair and make me repeat *No, No, No.*" It is the hardest word to learn—that little word *No.*

Important factors in the consideration of the lives of all successful men are the temptations that environ them. Mr. Rice had many, but to them all he said "No"; for he had his eye on a goal nobler than that of mere personal distinction—the goal of being useful to his fellow-men.

His whole career was strangely romantic. Removed at an early age from the jurisdiction of his mother to a country school, he is informed one morning by a fellow-pupil that a negro, with a red handkerchief protruding from under his hat, is below in the playground. Prepared to expect such a person, Allen asks permission to leave the room, and, without exciting suspicion, joins his mother's emissary. Outside is a gig ; the child is hidden in the box under the seat and is driven off. At the borders of the State Mrs. Rice meets her son ; but bell-criers are already announcing his escape, and telegrams are flying about the country. At the coast they embark on a vessel, which is wrecked on the shore. The first night out, fearing betrayal, the mother separates herself from the survivors, and takes refuge with her child in the woods, making her way to Canada, where Allen is disguised as a girl and entered in a convent. Pursuit being thus baffled, they are soon enabled to sail for Europe, where they arrive safely and settle down in Germany.

The youth's recollections of his residence there are extremely interesting. A battle of the Schleswig-Holstein war occurs near the village in which he is living, and he beholds with surprise a train full of the vanquished in retreat. Ten minutes afterwards comes another train, along the same track, containing victors, their shouts of triumph and their war-songs awakening the echoes of the quiet country, and their arms and accoutrements gleaming from the windows.

After the death of his mother he passed a year in America, and then entered Oxford, where he took the highest possible degrees in the shortest possible time.

The most distinctive step in his career was, of course, his purchase of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. "I set myself to thinking," he has often remarked, "how I could best resuscitate that periodical, and I decided to make it the mouthpiece of both sides of every question." "Give me men of action," was a favorite expression of Mr. Rice's. It follows that he believed that the leader in any movement, the originator of anything new in science, or the person distinguished by his deeds, was the best exponent of his views or acts, even though lacking in the skill to express or describe them in the choicest literary style. Mr. Rice's sagacity was proved when THE REVIEW quickly assumed the lead of all similar periodicals in the country.

His first important undertaking was the Charnay expedition, in consideration of which the French Government made him an officer of the Legion of Honor. Next we find him showing up the difficulties of the Panama Canal route, and shortly after exposing his life in Pittsburg, where he had gone to study the labor question. The establishment of a press syndicate followed closely upon the founding of *Le Matin*, in Paris, at the same time that he was urging a new copyright law and editing the "Lincoln Reminiscences."

The greatest monument to Mr. Rice's fame, however, will always be his connection with ballot reform. The treachery that led to his defeat for Congress in 1886 opened his eyes to the enormities of the present system. In a series of articles he had previously disclosed the lamentable condition of affairs in Delaware, where dead men had long figured as voters; and in acknowledgment of his services he was earnestly besought to move into that State and to take a prominent place in the approaching contest for the Senatorship. New York also began to show her appreciation of his worth. The office of Aqueduct Commissioner was offered to him; next the Republican nomination for mayor at the last election; and with the return of his party to power he was appointed to one of the four great diplomatic missions.

His writings attest the broadness of his views, as well as his versatility. Art, socialism, the government of cities, Central American affairs, Lincoln, the copyright question, all engaged his pen; while the reminiscences of his experiences in Paris, where he was swept by the crowd into the Hotel de Ville and heard the proclamation of the present French Republic, evince the highest literary merit.

To sum up: Mr. Rice originated, as an editor, a policy on which journalism to-day is largely based; as a reformer, he started a movement that must be the reform of all reforms, and that every loyal American must have most sincerely at heart; and as a politician, he attained the highest honor ever achieved by one so young in the annals of his country. Finally, as a man of the world, he made for himself a recognized position in the most exclusive sets of two continents. The causes of his success were his extraordinary interest in whatever he undertook; an intense energy in carrying it out; and a certain directness both of perception and of action that bore him always straight to the point.

Yet, after all, any reflection on his success only makes more bitter the appreciation of our loss. Compared with what he would have made of his life had it been spared, it becomes a sketch, with its glorious possibilities only indicated by the boldness of the outlines. Indeed, he possessed many of the essential elements of greatness. If we do not perceive them, it is only because he is yet too near to us, too dear to us, and our eyes are still too wet with tears; for where other men made acquaintances, he made strong and lasting attachments. These were not confined to any one class. Gladstone said of him that he was the most fascinating young man he had ever met. Victor Hugo treated him with the utmost consideration. Alexandre Dumas, Laurence Oliphant, General Sherman, James Redpath, Henry George, Prince Napoleon, were all warmly attached to him; and when he visited his estates in Maryland the whole country-side turned out to bid him welcome. A delightful host, possessed of extraordinary magnetism and extreme good looks, he exercised a charm that few could resist, while his sympathy for sorrows, his kindness to children, and particularly to old people, can never be forgotten. With all his manifold interests, too, he was always planning some little pleasure for others, and many are the struggling inventors, artists, and literary men who have cause to remember his generosity. Indeed, it was the humanitarianism which Gladstone and the young American possessed in common that endeared each to each.

Allen Rice was the embodiment of humanity, with its warm sunniness, its hopefulness, its spontaneity, and its impulsiveness. Strong characters sometimes arouse antagonism in other strong characters, and his extraordinary energy may have occasionally given to his manner, when keenly interested, a slight flavor of aggressiveness; but he never bore a grudge; he regretted more the loss of a friend than might readily be imagined; and when he died his faithful servant, prostrated by grief, wept on his body, and declared that he had lost more than a master—a benefactor.

There are many who have the right to think that in the loss of Allen Thorndike Rice they have been deprived of a benefactor, and there are many others who feel that with his decease much of the brightness, the gladsomeness, and the sunshine of life has departed.

LLOYD BRYCE.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

FOREIGN INFLUENCE ON AMERICAN FICTION.

AMERICAN genius has faltered in the paths of fiction, as if uncertain of its footing. From the first our writers have been inclined to break away from classical leading-strings, but the development of our national life has been confusing, making it almost impossible for any clear conception of the artistic values peculiar to our civilization to be had amid the babel of our conflicting tastes. Just now we are trying to be French; yesterday we were cultivating the Russians; last week the English had us under their thumbs. Daudet and Maupassant, despite Mr. Howells's eloquent plea for Tolstoï, are influencing (to a surprising degree) the currents of American fiction at this moment, while Scott and Thackeray and Dickens are powerless. It would be interesting and deeply instructive if all thinking Americans could see with absolute vision just how this Latin influence has reached the centres of taste in the United States. The art of painting has, of course, felt the current of control through direct channels, but the art of fiction has communicated with Paris through London. Say what we may to the contrary, we Americans have taken up, with but the slightest modifications, the critical strain indicated by the British key-note sounded from the great London journals. I said this recently, and was answered by a distinguished writer, who asserted that, in the case of Tolstoï, the Americans took up "Anna Karénina" and "War and Peace" long before the English had read them. I replied, with the facts all in my favor, that it was the people of our country, and not the critics, who took this lead; for the critical approval of Tolstoï's interminable, dreary, and oft-times disgusting novels came from Paris to London, and thence to America.

The Briton does not respond as readily as we do to the critical word of command. What we do we do at once and with all our might. Moreover, we are more susceptible to the influence of English authority than are the English themselves. The case of "Robert Elsmere" is in point. Mr. Gladstone's paper on that book made certain a tremendous sale for it on this side the seas. No American statesman could have made, by the same method, more than a ripple of interest for it. The Prince of Wales could create a furore throughout America for any work of fiction by adroitly lending himself to such an object as the suggestion implies. Under this lies a reason. We suspect at once that no mere vogue, no mere whim of popular taste, can account for a condition which has existed (with but slight variations) since the founding of our national independence, and we are warranted in looking for a strain running through the development of our local civilization—if I may use the phrase—a strain of education, tending directly toward engendering such a state of the public taste, Naturally the fiction that we read shapes in some degree the fiction that we write; but an alien art brings with it a touch of the foreign soil and a waft of the foreign air. The civilization of Great Britain is the opposite of a Republican civilization; that of France is even more pronounced in its attitude of antagonism to that crystal purity of democratic patriotism upon which, if upon anything, must forever depend the perpetuity of our national life. The political nihilism and the social gloom and pessimism of Russian fiction are said to be fairly representative of the trend of Russian national influence.

America, it would seem, can ill afford to have her children's characters formed in any large degree by direct alien forces; much less by those inimical to the fundamental principles of our moral, social, and political laws. "Art for art's sake" is the stumbling-block over which the self-conscious, faltering, note-taking genius is forever falling headlong, and when to this obstacle is added an always-present fear of offending foreign taste and attracting alien criticism, we have a thoroughly miserable artist, cutting and trimming desperately, with but faint prospect of ever doing anything really worthy the name of art. The reflex result of all this must be to create an exotic taste for fiction spiced with alien condiments. It has created such a taste. Year by year the book-stalls of America have been more and more overloaded with English novels of cheap workmanship (as regards both the literature and the printing) and of that peculiar cast of moral quality which comes of diluting French intrigue with English snobbery. In proportion to the increase of this tide of foreign fiction has been the decrease in the popularity of American fiction of the better class. At the same time it would appear that certain highly-gifted American authors, driven to desperation by their failure to succeed in the fair field of clean and high-toned work, have plunged into the apparently popular and probably remunerative current of a sensationalism almost bad enough to be called sensualism. The fact that a certain low grade of English novels and many poor translations of vicious French fiction do sell readily in our market has led American authors into believing that our public strenuously demands such products, when, in truth, the demand is largely the complement of a cheap supply. Doubtless there is in the sub-consciousness of the American people an ideal of fiction formed upon the essential peculiarities of our national life and imbued with the individual quality of our civilization; but this ideal is held in reserve by the force of alien influences which dominate our criticism and form the most potent element of our literary education.

A little observation and reflection will make plain to any understanding that the art of fiction has failed in America only in the novel, or at most in the fiction written with a special view to publication in book form. The short story, for instance, has been better developed in the United States than in any other country, with the exception of France, and just now I am not sure that even France has short story-writers superior to Aldrich, Cable, Edwards, Page, and Stockton—and I do not pretend to end the list here. Our great magazines have done excellent work in encouraging the short story by paying liberally for it; but where is the book of American short stories that has had the sale which has blessed Daudet's "Lettres de Mon Moulin"? A generous and general effort was made by reviewers, editors, correspondents, and everybody to urge Mr. Stockton's book of clever stories—"The Lady, or the Tiger?"—into a strong current of demand, but the result was not what the work really deserved, and the dreary "Peace and War" of Tolstoï out-sold Mr. Stockton's bright and strikingly original work, simply because the Tolstoï fad had behind it the force of alien indorsement. Mr. Howells was editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* for many years, during which time he wrote a goodly number of his very best works of fiction; but he took no leading place in the esteem of Americans until he chanced (by the merest accident) to attract attention in England through a little essay in the pages of the *Century* magazine. It was a personal and critical sketch of Henry James and his writings, and five or ten lines of it did the work which a dozen clever novels had failed to do. In fact, that little paper made a foreign standing for both Howells and James, in so far as public attention could do it. No sooner had the English journals deigned to consider what they took for extreme temerity in Mr. Howells's apparent sneer at Dickens and Thackeray, than the Americans began to echo back the cry, or to take up cudgels for the compatriot who had shown pluck enough to beard the British bull.

Still, neither Mr. Howells nor Mr. James, with their names rung up and down and back and forth, day in and day out, for years, in every city, town, hamlet, and neighborhood of our country, has ever been able to compare editions with Zola, Daudet, or many another alien novelist; and yet America is the book-reading nation of the world! In England a novelist of the standing of Mr. Howells can take the manuscript of his latest novel to his publisher and receive in exchange for it a check

for from ten hundred to fifteen hundred pounds. Even Anthony Trollope received as much as fifteen thousand dollars for a novel. It is safe to say that there is not in America a publisher (not a magazine- or journal-owner) who would pay Mr. Howells the half of such a sum. In a word, we present the curious condition of a nation reading more books than any other nation in the world, and at the same time paying to its own writers of high merit the smallest incomes offered to such authors within the limits of civilization. A leading element in the general cause of this state of things may be found in the American reverence for the cheap counter. Low-priced books flung out in heaps constitute the chief feature of our book-stalls, and in these heaps are found but very few American books. The native author is protected from home thieves. These stalls are bazaars for the sale of stolen wares, but the wares are necessarily all of foreign production. How is it possible for any high ideals to be generated in a country whose people are (intellectually) mere dependents upon foreign modes, vogues, and criterions of judgment? How shall we have a sane public vision and a sound public sense of morality so long as our bookstores are but whitened literary fence-dens? Mr. Lowell's sentence, "A book honestly come by is better than a cheap book," would look like humor if used as a sign over any publishing house in America, perhaps, and yet it is thought a matter of wonder that the art of fiction in this country is at a low ebb. A moral taint is more insinuating than any known essential substance. Dishonesty in one branch of the book-making business must affect the whole process from pen-nib to press and saleroom. On the other hand, there is no escape from popular corruption in literary taste, in social usage, in political purpose, and in moral quality, so long as bad books, alien books, books inimical to republican life and deadly to the social simplicity and moral purity of a democratic people, are read by our population in preference to American books.

In conclusion, I may say that the attitude of the American Congress toward this question of international copyright has been demoralizing in the extreme. It is to be hoped that Congress may soon atone for having said (by indirection) to the American people that it is morally right for us to steal and be stolen from, provided always that the subject of the theft is the property that an author has in the product of his literary labor; but no future Congress can ever quite undo the evil which has been wrought in the fibre of American life by the iteration and reiteration of such a doctrine.

MAURICE THOMPSON.

II.

AMERICAN AUGURIES.

IN THE winter of 1849 Sir Roderick Murchison received a boxful of minerals gathered in the foothills of the Australian Alps, and at once published a circular predicting the advent of a time when the bonanza sensation of upper California would repeat itself in the highlands of New South Wales. Sir Roderick himself had never visited that colony, and could not learn that gold had ever been discovered in southern Australia; but the resemblance of the minerals to those of the Ural and the Sierra Nevada sufficed to convince him that the precious metal must exist in large quantities. The subsequent discovery of placer-deposits rivalling those of the Sacramento Valley hardly astonished the geological prophet; he had felt sure that time would, sooner or later, confirm his prediction, because, as he expressed it in a letter to an Australian friend, "the analogy held good in all other particulars."

By a similar method of inference we might often anticipate the destiny of nations, even at the risk of awakening the anathemas of those metaphysicians who persist in considering man as an *alter ens*—a being governed by laws distinct from or even opposed to those of Nature in general. "For many years," says Herbert Spencer, "after men of science had become uniformitarians in geology, they remained catastrophists in biology; while recognizing none but natural agencies in the genesis of the earth's crust, they ascribed to supernatural agency the genesis of the organisms on its surface. Nay more, among those who are convinced that living

beings in general have been evolved by the continued interaction of forces everywhere operating, there are some who make an exception of man, or who, if they admit that his body has originated in the same manner as the bodies of other creatures, yet allege that his mind has not been evolved, but specially created."

The bias of a similar prejudice might scout the validity of such inferences as the prediction that the propaganda of our temperance reformers will achieve its main success in the Southern States of the American Republic, while the doctrine of political liberalism will find its most favorable soil further north ; yet in comparing the social development of Europe and North America it cannot be denied that "the analogy holds good in all other respects." Like Great Britain, New England has become a hive of industry ; like southern Europe, New Spain (as the Spaniards used to call their Mexican colony) has evolved a large crop of mendicants and miracle-mongers. There are strongholds of conservatism in the upper Alleghanies, as in the upper Alps ; and the deserts of southern Arizona, like the *despollados* of southern Spain, are beginning to bristle with bandits. There is no doubt that the prohibition of the traffic in alcoholic intoxicants—medicated "bitters" and all—is destined to become the law of the United States, but it is equally certain that the strict enforcement of that law will prove far easier in Georgia than in Maine or Massachusetts. Summer heat is an eloquent temperance argument. "Whoever drinks stimulating liquors," says Dr. J. T. Gardner, "and travels in the hot sun, will certainly suffer from headache, and in countries where *miasmata* prevail he will be far more liable to the attack of epidemic diseases." That physiological fact is the chief secret of the comparative temperance of nations whose habits, in other respects, would almost seem to justify the belief in the correlation of low morals and low latitudes. The southern coast towns of the future may swarm with lazzaroni, but southern topers will abound only in the chill highland districts, where even now the demand for alcohol would survive the demolition of illicit distilleries.

Those same highland districts, however, will remain strongholds of political independence for centuries after the often-predicted Cæsars of the South may have established their court in Nashville or Atlanta ; and southern Pontiffs, too, will find it difficult to enforce their dogmas upon the Waldenses and Covenanters of western North Carolina—even if the flavor of those dogmas should be sweetened by the development of southern poetry and southern art. The material prosperity of our national territory will continue to increase for a series of generations, irrespective of political changes, for there is no doubt that the least pressure of over-population will extend the southern boundaries of Anglo-America, and only absolute ignoring of historical analogies can fail to foresee the day when the peril of an Ethiopian marasmus will be obviated by a fierce, but promptly-decisive, war of races. Before long—perhaps before the semi-centennial of Emancipation—increase of number and of material resources will tempt the beneficiaries of the Fifteenth Amendment to seal their doom by trying conclusions with the descendants of their former masters, and I will here record the prediction that within the life-term of many of my contemporaries the scenes of the Seminole War will repeat themselves in the swamps of the Mississippi Valley, and that before the end of the twentieth century Sambo Africanus will have become a sporadic phenomenon anywhere north of the twentieth parallel.

The time is near when "arbor festivals" will be too popular to be limited to a single day in the year. Judging from old-world analogies, the progress of forest-destruction will, before long, reduce a large area of our farm-lands to the necessity of artificial irrigation. All through the lowlands of our southern cotton States, but especially in western Arkansas, western Georgia, and central Alabama, severe droughts will become a yearly affliction, and a considerable portion of southern Missouri and central Texas will become too dry for agricultural purposes. Droughts will drive an ever-increasing number of lowland settlers towards the foothills of the southern Alleghanies, which are undoubtedly destined to become the most productive portion of our national territory, not even excepting the garden-lands of the Sacramento Valley, where the disappearance of the Sierra

forests will yearly reduce the available means of irrigation. A detritus of treeless mountain slopes will shoal the estuaries of our eastern seaboard, especially at the mouths of the Savannah and Potomac; and the reckless destruction of the Adirondack woodland may tend to obstruct navigation on the upper Hudson, which even now is, as it were, living rather beyond its means by occupying quarters (very probably a prehistoric outlet of the St. Lawrence) too spacious for its proper resources.

Locusts, too, will sooner or later pay yearly visits to the cereal plains of the Mississippi Valley, but even before that time the necessity of protective forest-laws will be demonstrated by a still more impressive *argumentum ad hominem*. The climatic changes which never fail to follow the disappearance of arboreal vegetation make summer droughts more severe, but at the same time tend to make winter floods more and more destructive; and the experience of the eastern continent has established the fact that the valleys liable to the most ruinous inundations are those of rivers *fed by numerous highland streams* (bringing down the floods of torrents swollen by the sudden thaw of accumulated snows), like the River Po, the Oder, and the Rhone, or of large rivers *following the line of an isotherm*, rather than of a meridian, and thus receiving the simultaneous drainage of a large area opening the sluice-gates of its spring flood, not gradually, but at once, like the Yang-tse-Kiang, whose inundations are known to have done China more harm than all her wars and epidemics taken together. But the Ohio happens to combine the two elements of peril, and will yet avenge the fatuous waste of its hill forests by snow floods routing the settlers of its bottom-lands as the inhabitants of a Lancashire mill valley are routed by the bursting of a large reservoir.

Will the converts of Mormonism establish their empire in Spanish America? *Quien sabe?* But it seems clear that their schism has passed the repressible stage—though Spiritualism may eventually prove a more formidable foe to Orthodoxy and the chief rival of that reviving Nature-worship which is already gathering its votaries in our turner-halls and mountain resorts.

The continued influx of foreign elements will make it difficult to repress a reaction of Nativism; though, on the other hand, our open frontier would hopelessly complicate the problem of enforcing restrictive edicts; but the next three decades will partly obviate the dilemma by diverting the stream of European emigration to African and South American Eldorados.

Trans-Atlantic traffic will possibly be modified by quite novel systems of locomotive machinery, but I predict that, in the meantime, the perils of the sea will yet be diminished by means of *companion steamers*—passenger packets starting pairwise and keeping close enough for mutual assistance in case of accident, the probability being about as a million to one against the chance of their simultaneous shipwreck.

FELIX L. OSWALD.

III.

THE FUTURE OF THE NEWSPAPER.

"ARE the newspapers, especially the Sunday editions, likely to keep on increasing in size, or is there a limit at which the line will be drawn? If the latter, where is the limit to be placed It is becoming burdensome even to glance through one of the Sunday editions, but if one wishes to keep up with the times he must do so, for the very thing which it is important for him to know may be hidden away at the bottom of the last column, in the most unlikely place; and yet if he should overlook it, the result might be serious. Of course, the pages that are wholly given up to advertising can be disposed of in short order, but all the others must at least be carefully looked at."

"For my part, I wish there were no Sunday papers at all; not because I am a strict Sabbatarian or because I am simple enough to believe that the work of making the Sunday papers is to any large extent done on Sunday. I am unable to see anything wicked in reading a Sunday paper, and, of course, I know that it is Monday's paper, not Sunday's, which is prepared on Sunday. My objection is not a sentimental one; it is purely practical. I like to go to church on Sunday morning.

Now, I find that if I do this, and then undertake to read even two of the New York papers, I have not a moment of time for anything else. There is a good deal in them that I feel I can't afford to miss; yet there is a good deal else in the world that I should like to read, and then I want some time to spend with my family and friends. Really these Sunday papers give me neither peace nor rest, and if they keep on increasing in size, I shall actually not know what to do."

The foregoing are remarks which have been uttered in my hearing within the last week, and I have heard many others like unto them. Even the comic-weekly squib, which represents a small newsboy saying that he can sell newspapers on week-days, but that he is not big enough yet to carry a Sunday edition, is not without a reasonable degree of point and pertinence in connection with this subject.

What is the future of the newspaper in this country to be? Is the present tendency to increased bulk only a temporary thing, and will the reaction bring back the more reasonable size of former days? When a man buys a morning paper, does he want a volume or only a compact and intelligible compendium of the news of the day? Especially are these questions in point as applied to the Sunday editions. Their tendency to enlarged magnitude is unmistakable at the present time. Is this tendency to persist and to increase? Where can the limit be drawn—at thirty pages, or forty, or fifty? One paper that I have in mind, which formerly furnished its readers eight pages on Sunday, is rarely now contented with less than sixteen or twenty. Another, which a few years ago printed twelve pages, now invariably prints sixteen or twenty. And this same tendency has to a certain extent manifested itself in the week-day editions. A New York paper which until lately won wide popularity and numerous readers because of its compactness, and the ability with which its staff "boiled down" the news, has so far changed its policy of long standing as to increase its size regularly from 25 to 50 per cent.; and another, which for more than a generation never comprised more than eight pages, except when some uncommon "feature" demanded a large amount of space, now prints ten pages on every week-day, with a very rare exception now and then on Monday.

These are significant facts, but it is impossible as yet to determine with accuracy the ultimate goal to which they tend. It is true that more space is given to advertising than formerly; but that is a matter easily in the control of the business manager. A limited amount of advertisements at high rates is equally profitable with a large amount at low rates; and the balance-sheet is the main thing to be considered on this head. There would seem to be a physical limit to the number of pages which a daily journal can profitably print from day to day, but where that limit is to be set is a matter of pure conjecture. There is even more certainly a limit to the amount of matter which the average reader will consent to wade through in search of the vital and necessary news of the day.

"*Gratiano* speaks an infinite deal of nothing, more than any man in all Venice. His reasons are as two grains of wheat hid in two bushels of chaff: you shall seek all day ere you find them, and when you have them, they are not worth the search." Are not the words which Shakespeare puts into the mouth of *Bassanio* applicable to the greater part of what our newspapers are in the habit of publishing? Is it not, in truth, an "infinite deal of nothing"?

It seems to me most probable that the readers of newspapers have the solution of the question in their own hands. A newspaper must publish what people want, or else they will not buy it. The aim of the newspaper is to meet its readers' wishes. If people complain that the tone of the press is low and that too much space is given to murders, sensational matters, and the proceedings of the divorce court, the answer is that it is their own fault; if readers did not enjoy and demand these things they would not be printed. As in the matter of the quality of the newspaper, so in regard to its dimensions. If readers make their wishes known, editors and publishers must hear and heed.

At the present time most readers are glad to take their opinions from their favorite paper and want the comments on the news furnished along with the news itself. Perhaps the time may come when this will be changed, either by the elimination of the editorial page altogether or by the skillful blending, by specially-trained writers

of opinions with the news articles themselves. The newspaper is here—by a large majority; and it has undoubtedly come to stay. Its precise force and influence as a factor in civilization it is hard to estimate with accuracy. That it is capable of betterment not even the most enthusiastic "journalist" will presume to deny. Let me close by suggesting one or two of the lines along which the needed improvements ought to proceed. There should be less crudity and more care in the style and form in which the news is expressed. Condensation must be studied, and the art of putting much in small space acquired. The expression of editorial opinions may wisely be confined within narrow limits; unless, indeed, the newspaper is to become what it concededly is not now—the leader and moulder of public opinion. The daily newspaper need not seek to be a cyclopædia of all that is going on in the world: leave to the special and technical journals each its own field. The real news of the world is necessarily an expanding quantity, and hence the newspaper of the future must become more and more eclectic, if it is to be kept within reasonable and *readable* limits. Above all, let readers remember that the journal which they subscribe for and make a practice of reading may be to a very large extent—much larger, probably, than most of them imagine—moulded by themselves, and made what they would wish it to be. The inalienable right of fault-finding is every reader's own, and editors wince under the criticism that is severe, but at the same time friendly. If any reader of this article questions my statement, he need only try the experiment himself to be convinced.

JULIAN PROCTOR.

IV.

ABOLISHING POVERTY—ON PAPER.

IT BEGINS to look very much as though neither Henry George nor Dr. McGlynn will succeed for some years to come in abolishing poverty. I recall the old story of the ardent Irish patriot, who, a few years since, was telling a visiting tourist in the Green Isle how many hundred thousand armed men there were in Ireland ready at a moment's notice to free their beloved country from the rule of the English oppressor. "Well, why don't they go ahead and do it?" was the natural question of the tourist. "Begorra," replied Paddy, in entire good faith, "the police won't let them." So, when we ask Mr. George and Dr. McGlynn why they do not go ahead and abolish poverty, they virtually reply that society will not let them; which is only another way of acknowledging that their scheme is impracticable—a fact which every sane man knew from the start.

Undeterred, however, by the signal failure of these earnest but mistaken men, I have decided to come forward with a little scheme of my own for abolishing poverty; not, indeed, at once, as will be seen, but in the course of about two hundred and fifty years. My scheme, in brief, is for those who are most anxious to abolish poverty to raise the sum of ten thousand dollars in cash, or more if possible, and put it out at compound interest, until the principal shall become so immense that the interest annually accruing from it will be large enough to change the whole face of society. In order to bring the matter more nearly home to us to-day, let us suppose that some wise philanthropist, say in the year 1629, had set aside that sum of money, with the proviso that neither principal nor interest should be touched until the year 1889, at which time the whole amount should be safely invested and the interest forever after devoted to the alleviation of poverty and to such other humane objects as should commend themselves to a wisely-selected board of Anti-Poverty trustees, two of whom might, perhaps, be Mr. George and Dr. McGlynn. I venture to say that the actual money result to-day of such a fund would far surpass the wildest dreams of the crankiest Anti-Poverty disciple in the world.

As thus, for instance: Assuming that, when put out at compound interest, the principal doubles itself every fifteen years,—no very extravagant assumption,—the ten thousand dollars invested in 1629 would to-day amount to the inconceivably enormous sum of One Hundred and Eighty-four Billions, Two Hundred and Seven Millions, Three Hundred and Sixty Thousand Dollars! And this sum invested at the rate of 4 per cent. would yield an annual income of Seven Billions, Three Hundred

and Sixty-eight Millions, Two Hundred and Twenty-four Thousand, Four Hundred Dollars, which sum, be it remembered, would be available every year in perpetuity for the noble but misty objects of the Anti-Poverty Society. But in order to allow for leakages, and to avoid the consideration of a cumbrous number, let us make our interest an even five billion dollars a year instead of the seven-odd billions just mentioned as the actual interest of our fund. What then will we able to do with this great income?

First of all, we notice the fact that five billions of dollars is just about half the money in active circulation in the civilized world. This means that half of the work done in the world would be done under the auspices and for the sole benefit of our supposed Anti-Poverty Society. Moreover, a large proportion of the capitalists and employers of labor in the civilized world would be simply the agents of the Anti-Poverty Society. The banks and other institutions which now lend money would find much, if not all, of their business gone. For the Anti-Poverty Society would virtually own the earth and everything thereon, and would, therefore, be the greatest lending institution in the world. It could exact its own terms of interest, and controlling, as it would, most of the labor, the money, and commodities of the world, it would have absolute power to control the property of the world in accordance with its principles. The capitalist, the man of business, the retired man of wealth, and the workingman, all would be paying a percentage out of their income to this great autocrat of human destiny. It would, however, at once strike a snag that might—nay, that would—prove fatal to the society, unless it succeeded in making over this human nature of ours. The strong-brained, acquisitive men, whose very nature it is to work with both brain and hand in order to acquire wealth, would lose heart and stop working. On the other hand, an immense number, possibly a majority, of the world's workingmen, knowing that the Society would provide for them anyhow, would also stop working. Or, if they worked at all, it would be in a listless way that would be of little value. So, therefore, the world's industries would come to a sudden and disastrous stand-still, and at the end of the year the five billion dollars of interest due the Anti-Poverty Society would not be paid on account of the general cessation of work. And there would be no way to enforce the payment, unless all the civilized governments of the world should unite to do it. But even that would not avail if the debtors did not have the money to meet their obligations, for you cannot squeeze blood out of a stone.

Take away from men the hope that they may possibly better themselves some day or other—a hope that is latent in nearly every human breast—and you would at once destroy all human progress. Cruel as the principle of competition is,—and it is very cruel,—it is, nevertheless, a fundamental principle in any human society that is possible in the world as at present constituted. With all the inequalities for which it is responsible, civilization thrives under it. It has led men up out of barbarism to at least some semblance of a noble humanity. And no quicker road to intellectual death and social chaos could be found than the withdrawal of this mighty principle from the sum total of human life.

But we will suppose that our Society has successfully got around this difficulty. Somehow or other, everybody is happy and contented, as the hired agents of the Anti-Poverty Society. The banker and the merchant turn over their profits to the Society, receiving in lieu of them whatever the Society thinks fit to give them as wages. And the toilers of the world in the mines, in the factories, in the workshops, and on the farms continue to work just as hard, although they know that, being poor men, the great Anti-Poverty Society will see that they get their "share" whether they work or not. All right; now let us consider what the Society will do with its five billions of dollars a year. First of all, if it wanted to clear off our national slate, it could pay our national debt and the immense national debt of Great Britain out of one year's income, and then have enough left to wipe out the debt of the city of New York. And if it cared about indulging in such works of supererogation, it could in a very few years pay off the national debt of every nation in the world. But perhaps it might be thought that this would be only an indirect way of abolishing poverty, and so we will not consider it. In the next place, it might buy great ter-

ritories of fertile land to give to the landless. To be sure, the vast majority of the landless could have land to-day if they would go where it is. But, as we know, they do not want land unless it comes in the form of a corner lot in a big city with a big house on it. But the Anti-Poverty Society has declared that the landless must and shall have land, and so we will suppose it bought for them. Perhaps when they understood that they would have a perpetual claim on the income of the Society so long as they remained poor, they would consent to occupy the land which was decided to be their share, simply as gentlemen of leisure. But inasmuch as the Society would sternly refuse to help them the moment they became well-to-do, we may be quite su e that they would not work much; for if they worked, they might happen to become well-to-do. And then they would not only cease to be protégés of that human Providence, the Anti-Poverty Society, but they would be making some other men poor. For rich men necessarily imply poor men, in the present order of things.

It is true that, with such an income as we are considering, an Anti-Poverty Society could do much to diminish vice and crime. It could, for instance, buy up all the intoxicating liquors of the world, and hire the manufacturers not to make any more. But that would not stop the drinking habit. In some way, the men who wanted liquor would either make it or get it in spite of the Society. Or, again, the Society could establish and endow a large number of agencies for the education and reformation of the people. But even that would not bring on the millennium. Human nature would continue to be about what it is to-day—composite in its character, with the good and the bad so inextricably woven together that they can never be entirely separated.

What our doctrinaire social reformers would value most highly would be the opportunity to give the "under dogs" in our social life a chance, by giving them their "share" of the world's good things. But when it came to applying this glittering generality to concrete cases, they would get into trouble at once. For instance, do the men who run up our immense national drink-bill deserve any more money than they already get? As a matter of social ethics, do they really deserve the money they now earn? Then as to the immense number of men in the world with very slender abilities, or with no abilities at all, ought they to get as much as the men with great abilities? Still again, would it be either good policy or good morals to give anything out of a general fund to the great army of lazy and vicious men and women? And lastly, supposing that some little junta of social reformers were able to-day to make an absolutely equal division of the property of the world without any reference to the individual endowments of men, how long would it be before the old inequalities would again appear?

I started out with proposing a plan for abolishing poverty. But, after all, I find that my scheme will not work. Instead of abolishing poverty, it would make everybody poor, and not only poor but hopeless. An autocrat, or a committee of autocrats, with an absolute power to control and distribute the wealth of the world, could do little or nothing to put an end to the inequalities between men. On the contrary, by their unwise, though well-meant, interference with the great laws of social economy, they would soon impair, if not destroy, the whole structure of civilization.

JAMES B. WASSON.

V.

"THOUGHT-TRANSFERRENCE."

IN A recent article in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW—"The Open Gate of Dreamland"—I narrated some observed facts of hypnotism, which had led me to the belief that mind-reading and all forms of "thought-transferrence" were delusions. Dr. Post in a later number traverses my conclusion, and suggests that it "may be premature," and founded on my not having witnessed phenomena observed by others.

With this position I have no controversy, for towards the unknowable—or perhaps it were wiser to say the unknown—I am an agnostic. But you will permit me to add

that, since writing the article in question, I have tried other experiments strongly tending to confirm its conclusions. I have dipped into "mind-reading," and have myself, found hidden articles and done things which had been secretly agreed upon by other persons, one of whom accompanied me with his hand upon my forehead. The key to ascertaining the purpose was, of course, successfully observing and interpreting the muscular impulse. I found the thing secreted, or did the thing described, unerringly and with considerable alacrity, exactly as water finds its level by flowing in the direction of the least resistance. I have no doubt that anybody with quick sensibilities can do the same thing, and, after a little practice, with as much readiness as any professional muscle-reader in the field. But the Barkis who officiates as companion in the experiment must be "willin'."

So much for that. When Dr. Post postulates that "the muscles belonging to one body may be controlled by the mind belonging to another," I have only to say, "Prove it." When I am told that the indulgence in profound and vehement thinking on the part of a nurse kept a patient from vomiting, I am inclined to say, "Maybe the patient would not have vomited any way." When I am told that a mind-reader who had been secretly "willed" to kiss a young lady felt an almost irresistible "contraction of the orbicularis oris" on approaching her, I have only to add that one swallow does not make a summer or one pucker a universal law.

It should be remembered that many of the observers of "thought-transferrence" seem to be rapid generalizers, and that rapid generalization is fatal to scientific accuracy. In fact, I think the skeptical mood is the one in which all investigators should approach both hypnotism and "mind-reading," and that they should not only remember that coincidences explain most of the mysterious in human life, but that research should proceed on the identical lines that would be followed if it were known that all the persons concerned were dishonest, and were bent on the perpetration of fraud.

As to Dr. Post's defence of physicians, I have only to say that while the medical societies of the United States decline to investigate hypnotism, much less practise it, most doctors take pains to condemn the practice of it by "laymen," and only the other day I was advised by one of the most distinguished physicians in the country to "give it up," and he predicted dire evils if I should persist in experimenting with hypnotes. As the advice was not paid for or even solicited, it may at least be assumed to have been sincere.

W. A. CROFFUT.

VI.

PROTECTION FOR OUR LANGUAGE.

THE English language as spoken by the American people is subject to great and rapid changes. Among a people so little conservative every one seems to feel at liberty to coin words and take liberties with his mother tongue. The varied foreign elements pouring into our country from every nation under the sun, the extent and variety of our territory, the vast sectional industries carried on, the cosmopolitan and migratory character of our people, their omnivorous habit of taking intellectual pabulum from all nations and languages and tongues—all these are constantly transforming our language. While these things may prevent a tendency to distinct dialects and serve in a measure to knead our language into a compact whole, yet they keep pouring into the mass an endless variety of new elements, and thus it is at the mercy of an infinite number of fluctuating forces.

It is of interest to every American that the language in which the English classics have been written shall be kept as pure as possible, and that all changes shall be made with the greatest care. In no way can this be so well accomplished as through an American Academy of Language. No other means will so effectually secure unity, prevent sectionalism, and abolish dialects. No mere dictionary-making, whether by one man, one university, or a committee of men, can secure the greatest permanence, breadth, or unity to a language. When the standard of a language is left for the individual lexicographer to establish, sectionalism will at once come in. The West can complain that it is controlled by the usage or dictum of the East, or vice

versa. The battle waged between the admirers or allies of different lexicographers produces an endless confusion; and dictionary-buying becomes an expensive luxury, while the buyer has a vague feeling that the latest "unabridged" will be a transitory authority.

What is imperatively needed is an American Academy of Language, with representatives from every section of our country. Every first-class college or university should be entitled to have a member. Only the best linguists and scholars should be allowed to become members. Such men would win the respect of the nation by their scholarship and soon establish a standard of pronunciation and orthography that would be recognized and obeyed as *the authority* on such subjects for Americans. And it would not be long before the scholars of England would coöperate with them, and we should then have a standard for all English-speaking people. In what way could a part of the much-discussed "treasury surplus" be spent that could bring us more honor or lasting profit than in founding such an institution?—a national monument of which all Americans would be proud, a permanent testimonial to our national culture, wisdom, and patriotism. Unsectional and thoroughly American, representing our ripest scholarship and broadest development, it would become an authority to which we would not only gladly submit, but to which we would all eagerly appeal.

N. A. CAMPBELL.

VII.

FRENCH PROPER NAMES IN ENGLISH.

IN CONNECTION with my work recently, I have been interested in observing how frequently French proper names are anglicized, becoming something entirely different from what they originally were. The town in which my notes were made lies near the Canadian boundary and contains a large population of French Canadians—day laborers and mill-hands. When a family of this class come there, they retain for about one generation, usually, the name by which they were known when they arrived. The older members of the family, the parents, generally retain their French name as long as they live, but as their children grow up they almost always change. There seem to be two reasons for this. The first is that, as the younger generation grow up, speaking the English language, and surrounded by American customs and institutions, they desire to become Americans in all things, and so prefer American names. The second is that the business men with whom they deal, particularly the merchants, who in the way of trade have to write their names frequently, find the French forms inconvenient, if not impossible, and so adapt them in some way to the English tongue, Sometimes, indeed, the change is made by inventing entirely new names—a method to which the Canadian usually agrees with the most remarkable equanimity.

Where, as is usually the case, the French name has a meaning which has an equivalent in our language, the latter is used as the substitute. In this way Boivert has become Greenwood,—*bois*, wood, and *vert*, green; Boulanger becomes Baker, Bienvenu is transformed into Welcome, Lemieux into Betters, and Couturier into Tailor. Roche is French for rock or flint, and Joseph la Roche becomes plain Joe Stone. No less complete, and much more unreasonable, is the change from Henrichon to Anderson, and from Morin to Morrill. From St. Pierre to St. Peter is an easy and natural step. Frequently the most astonishing results arise from an attempt to anglicize the spelling of a French pronunciation. This has given us Prue for Proulx, Rushlow for Rocheleau, Veno for Vigneault, Derusha for De Roche, Longeway for Langevin, and Young for Dionne.

Many more examples might be given, but these are enough to show one way in which our vocabulary of proper names is enlarged more rapidly than would at first, perhaps, have seemed probable.

M. B. THRASHER.

SOUTH END.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXCIII.

AUGUST, 1889.

THE MONEY SENT TO JOHNSTOWN.

BY THE HON. JAMES A. BEAVER, GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA.

THE APPALACHIAN range or system of mountains includes the head-waters of the streams which water and furnish the drainage for at least two-thirds of the State of Pennsylvania. The Alleghenies, which constitute the principal member of the system, divide the waters which flow eastward to the Atlantic and southwestward to the Gulf of Mexico. On the 31st of May of the present year peculiar meteorological conditions existed along this system of mountains, which resulted in a rainfall of unprecedented volume. In some localities more than six inches of rain fell within twenty-four hours. In others great cloud-bursts deluged the immediate vicinity, and in a few minutes raised the small streams as never before. There seemed to be literally a war of elements, waged with differing degrees of intensity, but kept up during the day throughout the entire region. The statement of the fact that three inches of rain are sufficient to make an ordinary freshet will show at once what results were to be expected from such a rainfall as occurred on the ill-fated day to which reference has been made. As a result of this unprecedented storm, some twenty counties of Pennsylvania were visited by floods which had no parallel in the history of the region. From Tioga County on the New York line to Bedford on the Maryland

line, through the great mountain centre of the State, this flood carried destruction, desolation, and death in its onward sweep.

The streams which constitute the West Branch of the Susquehanna and the Juniata River on the eastern slope of the Alleghenies, and those which form the Conemaugh on the western slope, were principally affected. The most unusual floods heretofore occurring, which are remembered because of their destruction of life and property, took place in Pennsylvania in the years 1786 and 1865. In some localities the waters were higher during both of these freshets than in that of the present year. But the Susquehanna River, at Harrisburg, which is below the mouth of the Juniata River, was eighteen inches higher in the present year than in 1786, and twenty-seven inches higher than in 1865, notwithstanding the fact that the North Branch, which is one of the principal tributaries of the main river, was not extraordinarily high. This will, in a measure, indicate what the rise in the West Branch and in the Juniata must have been. The counties bordering on the West Branch and its tributaries, and those along the different branches of the Juniata, were all more or less seriously affected by this extraordinary freshet. In many of them lives were lost, homes and all their contents swept away, and property to the extent of probably fifty millions of dollars utterly destroyed. At the city of Williamsport, which is the centre of a large lumber-manufacturing trade, it is estimated that logs gathered there for the purpose of being manufactured into lumber, to the value of four millions of dollars, were swept away in a few hours. Other losses of a similar character, but not so great in extent, occurred at other points both above and below Williamsport. Railroad and county bridges across these streams were swept away by the score. All telegraphic and telephonic communication was entirely broken up, and the people for days, and in some instances for more than a week, were entirely isolated from the outside world.

Terrible as the scenes and incidents throughout the theatre of the operations of this storm on the eastern slope of the Alleghenies were, they were all dwarfed into littleness and comparative insignificance by the great calamity which befel the people of the Conemaugh Valley on the western slope of the mountain. The Conemaugh River, formed by the confluence of the north and south forks, is further augmented by

the water of Stony Creek, which joins it at Johnstown. Along the narrow valley which skirts the river above Johnstown were built some eight or nine different villages, most of them incorporated, which constituted a busy, thriving community, largely engaged in the manufacture of iron and steel and their various products, and also in other industries which provided for the wants of the numerous population engaged in these manufactures. The rainfall of the region was of itself sufficient to cause an extraordinary flood, destructive alike to life and property. A large reservoir situated on the south fork of the Conemaugh, built originally as one of the feeders to the Pennsylvania Canal, but which had long since been abandoned for that purpose, and was used as a fishing preserve for a company of gentlemen who had purchased it several years ago, was so suddenly and rapidly raised above its banks that all efforts to relieve the pressure upon its sustaining walls were unavailing. The dam suddenly gave way, precipitating the great body of water gathered there, augmented by the unusual rainfall, into the valley below.

The flood which had occasioned solicitude and alarm before, reënforced by the waters of this immense reservoir, came upon the people of this devoted region with such velocity and power that all attempts to escape its ravages were unavailing, notwithstanding the fact that all possible efforts to give notice of the impending calamity were made by those who were aware of its imminent approach. To add to the difficulties of the situation, just below the confluence of the Conemaugh and Stony Creek had been built by the Pennsylvania Railroad a large seven-arch stone bridge, of magnificent proportions and strength, which served to some extent as a breakwater, and against which the débris created by the flood was piled, causing an eddy so swift and strong that for a time the waters actually flowed up-stream and carried dwelling-houses and other buildings in large numbers upon their angry bosom. Upon the subsidence of the waters, in the course of a few hours, a busy community of from thirty to forty thousand people found itself utterly prostrated, and, to a large extent, practically destroyed. The loss of life resulting from this catastrophe is variously estimated at from five to ten thousand persons. The loss of property, impossible accurately to estimate, aggregated many millions.

Cut off from communication with the outside world by rail or

wire, it was difficult to obtain information. The morning papers of the 1st of June had intimations of a great disaster, and by the evening of that day some particulars of the ruin wrought were given to the public. The extent of the disaster was partially disclosed in the papers of Sunday morning, June 3. The cry of distress, which the facts alone presented, was heard throughout the length and breadth of the land. Fortunately, communication with the West was less seriously disturbed than with the East, and with the most commendable promptness and generosity the city of Pittsburg rushed to the relief of the sufferers. Philadelphia began her work of charity on Sunday, and made the most prompt and vigorous efforts to forward to the sufferers such help as could be hastily furnished. The Governor of Ohio, with his usual promptness, placed tents and other relief at the disposal of the sufferers, and despatched them at once from Columbus. On Saturday, the 1st of June, the response of the country and of the world to this wail of distress began, and has continued in an uninterrupted stream of beneficence, which has probably never been equalled, under like circumstances, in the history of our race.

An English paper, in speaking of the catastrophe at Johnstown, described it as the greatest calamity which ever befel the English-speaking race at a single blow. This description is, perhaps, not exaggerated. More lives have been lost in a single battle; but lives are expected to be lost in battle, and to its uncertain fortunes men intrust themselves with the knowledge of its fatal probabilities. In this case infancy and age were alike exposed to the fury of the storm and the horrors of the flood. Sex, sickness, and sorrow afforded no exemption. All were alike exposed, with the chances against the weak.

It is not intended to give any description of the horrors of the situation or of the details of the suffering which ensued. The baldest outline of events has been given in order to show that the calamity, although unprecedented, has had its sorrows and sufferings mitigated by a sweetness of charity and a wealth of benefaction which are also unparalleled.

This article is hastily prepared at the request of the Editor of THE REVIEW, not to describe the sufferings or to picture the sorrows of our stricken communities, but rather to show what has been done to relieve the one and mitigate the other.

Twenty of the sixty-seven counties of Pennsylvania have suf-

fered severely by the late floods. In ten of them there has been loss of life. The suffering and sorrow have been the same in kind and, in a sense, in degree, but differ largely in extent. Into eleven of these counties help from outside of them has gone. Several have taken pride in caring for their own people, and have nobly met the requirements and responsibilities of the situation. Many individual cases of suffering are being discovered and developed, and many more will doubtless come to light as time passes, but for all, whether suffering singly, in families, or in communities, provision has been made by a generous people quick to hear and always ready to respond to the cry of distress or of need.

Sorrow is essentially and almost necessarily selfish. "Behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow" has been, and is, the almost universal wail of suffering humanity. In view of this, it has been interesting to note the prominence which has been accorded to Johnstown among the several suffering communities of the State. It is not uncommon to have an application for assistance come couched in language like this: "Next after Johnstown, we have suffered more than any other locality in the State." The precedence given to the sufferers in the Conemaugh Valley among the several desolated communities themselves has also been accorded them in the sympathy and the benefactions of the country and the world.

What has been done in response to the bitter cry for help which their destruction and ruin wrung from the people to whom has been given by common consent this sad preëminence? What is the amount of the benefactions of generous donors which have flowed in a steady stream since the first day of June, and which continue to flow, with less volume, perhaps, but with no less sympathetic impulses to the present day? How have the benefactions of the people been applied, and what plans have been adopted for the relief and help of the beneficiaries of this fund? These are questions in which donors and recipients are alike interested, and which have an interest beyond the present case, as affecting great questions of sociology which are seeking, and have long sought in vain, for a final answer.

As already intimated, quick as the cry of distress came the generous response. First, in contributions of food and clothing from those nearest the scene of disaster, followed by donations of money from all parts of the civilized globe.

On the third day of June the Executive of Pennsylvania issued an appeal to the people of the United States, based upon reliable data which he was enabled that day for the first time to gather by direct communication with Johnstown. In this communication the facts attending the calamity in the Conemaugh Valley were briefly set forth, and the necessity for immediate and continued help for the suffering people was emphasized. Drexel & Co., previously designated by the Philadelphia committee, William R. Thompson & Co., previously named by the Pittsburg committee, and Jacob C. Bomberger, Esq., of Harrisburg, were designated as depositaries of funds intended for the relief of the sufferers by the floods in Pennsylvania.

Money in considerable amounts had been contributed in several localities on Sunday, the 2d of June, but on the following day the steady stream of beneficence began to flow and has continued without cessation until the present time (July 12th). At this date there have come into the hands of the Executive of Pennsylvania, and been deposited with the treasurer of the fund at Harrisburg, over one million of dollars.

The depositaries at Philadelphia and Pittsburg have each received almost eight hundred thousand dollars. The local committee at Johnstown has received in the neighborhood of two hundred thousand dollars. Various other local committees have received direct contributions for their immediate needs from their own localities and elsewhere aggregating probably two hundred thousand dollars ; so that the grand aggregate of contributions in money for the relief of sufferers by the floods in Pennsylvania will reach, if it has not already reached, the magnificent sum of three millions of dollars. To this must be added considerable sums still held by local committees, and the large contributions of supplies in kind furnished by the generous in many parts of the country who desired to afford speedy relief.

Nothing has been said as to the work of the beneficial and charitable organizations of the country which were early upon the ground at Johnstown with substantial aid and well-directed efforts for the alleviation of the suffering. Of the value of this work there can be no question, and it will ever be gratefully acknowledged by those who were its recipients. No means are at hand now, however, of estimating the amount expended through these several organizations. It is known to have been quite large, and

the good effects of it will be felt for many days to come. It is hoped that, when the official report of the work is prepared, statistics may be gathered and suitable mention made of it.

A million of dollars is a large amount of money for a single individual to handle. Its disbursement under any circumstances involves great responsibility; but to one who has had experience in philanthropic work, and who has endeavored to meet both the wishes of donors and recipients of a charity fund, the responsibility assumes much larger proportions, and is undertaken with great reluctance. The Executive of Pennsylvania, early recognizing the fact that the amount of money named was likely to come into his hands for disbursement among the sufferers by floods in that State, sought to relieve himself of the burden of responsibility by calling to his aid gentlemen of well-known experience in business and philanthropic work, so that the disbursement of the fund should not rest upon his single individual judgment or responsibility. It was early ascertained also that with separate committees at Philadelphia, Pittsburg, Johnstown, Williamsport, and other points, acting independently of each other, and without knowledge of disbursements and appropriations made by each, great confusion was likely to ensue, with probable duplication and consequent injustice. It was, therefore, necessary to have the operations for relief unified as much as possible, and brought into consistency and harmony. It was thereupon determined to appoint a Commission, consisting of representatives from the various principal committees, so that the knowledge of what had been done, and the plans and purposes of each of the several committees, might be secured for the information and guidance of all. This Commission, consisting of ten gentlemen, was appointed on the eleventh day of June, and under its direction and management all the work of relief throughout the entire flooded districts has been conducted.

The members of the Commission made a personal examination of those localities which were considered to have suffered most by the late floods. Supplies of food and clothing had previously been furnished wherever needed. Where local committees were found in charge of relief, doing efficient work, and able to furnish the Commission with data upon which immediate distribution for the relief of sufferers could be made, money was at once appropriated and placed in the hands of

these committees, to be used in such a way as their judgment might indicate. A position upon the Commission was offered to four different gentlemen of Johnstown, three of whom, by reason of the pressure of their private business, were unable to accept the trust, while the fourth, who was injured in the flood, was absent from home, and has but lately signified a like decision in regard to the matter. Being unable to secure a representative who by his personal knowledge could acquaint the members of the Commission with the immediate needs of the community, and being without data upon which intelligent action could be based, a representative of the Commission reluctantly undertook the work, and went to Johnstown with the intention of remaining there and giving personal attention to the gathering of data upon which the Commission might act in the distribution of the funds committed to its hands by a generous public. It is believed that this member of the Commission, coöperating with the local committee at Johnstown, which has been arduously engaged in gathering statistics, but has not yet been able to make a full report, will be able to meet the requirements of the situation, and bring the wants of the people more directly to the attention of the Commission. It is believed also that the preliminary work is about completed, and the losses and present condition of the inhabitants of the Conemaugh Valley are so far ascertained that intelligent efforts may be directed toward their more substantial relief.

The members of the Commission have regarded, and now regard, the funds at their command and disposal as a sacred trust, to be disbursed in accordance with the wishes of the donors, and in such a way as to meet, as far as possible, the reasonable expectations of those entitled to receive them. They regard this fund as one which must be disbursed upon the principles of charity, and not as an indemnity for losses in general sustained by individuals, without regard to their financial condition. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary to ascertain from each individual the amount of his losses, the amount saved from the wreck, the number dependent upon him or her, the ability to maintain those who are dependent, the relief, if any, obtained from other sources, and other like information upon which intelligent action can be based. This is an arduous work, requiring much time, particularly in a community whose very foundations have been destroyed and which is still in a chaotic condition. The wonder is that, with

each individual so thoroughly buried in his own sorrow, this work has been so far advanced and so well done by the local committee. Although not yet completed, it is believed that enough has been ascertained to make a distribution to those who are most needy an easy matter in the immediate future. The distribution of money will be made, not so much as an indemnity for losses as a means of helping the recipients to help themselves; that being regarded as the best charity which gives a man command of himself and of his remaining resources, and enables him to put them to the best account.

It is not to be inferred, from what has been said in regard to substantial relief, that relief has not been furnished hitherto. From the first day of June down to the present time, relief, in a constant stream, has flowed to the sufferers of the Conemaugh Valley. Food and clothing have been furnished *ad libitum*. No one whose wants have been made known, or who could be induced to make known his wants, has suffered for the necessaries of life. Transportation has been furnished to all the inhabitants of the valley who desired to go elsewhere for recuperation, or for the purpose of seeking employment, or for visiting friends. Wherever needed, plain furniture for housekeeping has been furnished upon application.

Early recognizing the importance of opening the channels of trade and restoring the *media* of supply and demand, the Commission, after consultation with the New York committee, directed the erection upon two small public squares, placed at their disposal by the municipal authorities, of forty-eight small storerooms, which are placed, as soon as completed, in the hands of the Citizens' Committee, to be awarded for such business as, in their judgment, is most needed in the community. This has already stimulated trade, and is restoring business to its wonted channels. Merchants who are able to build on their own ground have erected temporary buildings, and still others have cleaned out their former places of business, and are engaged in their ordinary trade.

The members of the Chicago Committee of Relief, after visiting the ground, and with the experience which was the result of their disastrous fire, generously donated to the community one hundred portable houses, ten feet by twenty feet in size, which it was supposed could be erected in a few hours, and would afford temporary shelter until something better could be provided. At the

earnest solicitation of the local committee, the Flood Relief Commission also contracted for two hundred houses from Chicago. One hundred were portable ones, ten by twenty feet, with a door at each end and two windows at each side, to be divided as the occupants might deem advisable. Another hundred houses were furnished, of a much better character, sixteen by twenty-four feet in size, making a desirable shelter; they can be divided into three rooms, and furnish pleasant accommodations for a family of four or five. Two hundred houses of a still more substantial character have been contracted for, each of which is two stories in height and contains four rooms. These the contractors have engaged to build as rapidly as they are wanted or as the sites can be furnished for the same. As many more such houses as may be needed will be built as required.

Some difficult and perplexing questions confront the Commission in the discharge of this part of their duty. Such houses, when built, are, of course, intended for the benefit of sufferers who have lost their homes and are unable to rebuild. Much of the desolated district is unfit to build upon. It is, therefore, necessary to secure ground elsewhere. Houses built upon the land of another might be claimed by the owner of the land. Importunate creditors might sweep away the benefactions so charitably intended only for the good of the sufferers. These and kindred questions are to be met, and met wisely. The representative of the Commission at Johnstown is a lawyer, has had much experience upon the bench, and is admirably qualified to handle just such questions, so that the wishes of the donors may be respected and the wants of the recipients carefully provided for.

Provision has also been made for the immediate distribution of a half million of dollars to the most needy of the sufferers of the Conemaugh Valley out of the funds at the disposal of the Commission, in the hope and with the expectation that the beneficial effects of such distribution, in stimulating building operations and restoring hope to the people, will more than counterbalance the evil effects which almost necessarily follow the distribution of cash to the recipients of charity; this sum being in addition to $150,000 already distributed by the Johnstown Committee to families in actual need at the rate of $10 *per capita*. It is, of course, well understood that, in the ordinary distribution of charity, it is unsafe and undesirable to intrust money to the

hands of those who are to be relieved. Although the force of this rule is acknowledged by the Commission as applicable to ordinary cases of charity, it must be remembered that this is an extraordinary case, requires extraordinary treatment, and its exigencies are not likely to be met by the enforcement of ordinary rules.

In the work of relief so far carried on, the Commission and its representative, and the committees represented upon it, have expended between one and two million dollars in actual outlay and in contracts already made, the exact amount not being at present attainable, since bills have not in all cases been rendered.

In addition to the relief work thus carried on, the State, under the authority and supervision of the State Board of Health, has conducted an efficient and thoroughly well-organized work in clearing the channels of the rivers and removing the accumulations of débris from the streets of the desolated districts, at an expenditure of something like a quarter of a million dollars. It is entirely safe, therefore, to say that the work done through these various agencies for the relief of the Conemaugh Valley has cost, up to the present time, between a million and a half and two millions of dollars. The work of feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, sheltering the homeless, and giving cheer to the despondent, in the hands of the Relief Commission, will be carried on without interruption, and its operations extended as rapidly as it is possible to do so intelligently, and with due regard to the rights both of the donors and the recipients of the funds intrusted to its keeping. The police work of the State will also be continued until all nuisances are abated, and Johnstown and its neighboring boroughs shall be pronounced to be in good sanitary condition.

Provision for the widows and orphans, of more than a mere temporary character, must undoubtedly be made with care and discrimination. Continued relief for bodily wants must be furnished as long as the necessity exists, and reasonable provision made for such needs in the future. The funds in the hands of the Commission, so far as they can be made to meet the demands of those who are entitled to help, can be used legitimately and with beneficial effect in restoring the people of the various desolated regions to family life and to a position so far independent as to enable them to help themselves. It is well to reiterate the

the plan and purpose of the Commission, so far as at present advised, to place people upon their feet and put them in a situation in which they can stand and walk alone. The dangers incident to the situation, which all experience has shown to be real, are appreciated, and no effort will be spared to reduce to a minimum the ill effects which must necessarily follow in the wake of a great wave of charity such as this.

Errors have been, and doubtless will be, committed. What seems to be tardiness to one is haste to another. The work of the Commission must be discharged, first, with reference to the obligations which are imposed upon it by the generous donors of the fund and their wishes in its distribution, and, second, with reference to meeting, so far as may be reasonable and just, the expectations of those who consider themselves entitled to its benefits.

This great charity fund, which constitutes a monument to the generous impulses of our common humanity, comes from many quarters. It is believed that every State and Territory of our country is represented in it. Our neighbors to the north of us and those to the south of us are also generous contributors to its upbuilding. England, Ireland, France, Germany, and other foreign countries share in donations to its fair proportions. A minute and careful record of all the contributions has been kept, and it is hoped that its publication, when the work of the Commission is completed, will show the source from which every cent has come. The donation, distribution, and reception of this fund give rise to many problems in social science, and the peculiarities of the situation, particularly in the Conemaugh Valley, raise very grave questions in regard to municipal government, which are full of interest, but which cannot now even be mentioned. Notwithstanding the fact that the government of some seven or eight municipalities was for the time utterly overthrown and in chaos, the strength of our institutions has been demonstrated, first, by the efforts of the civil authorities of Cambria County, in which the scene of the greatest devastation lies, and, second, upon the request of the sheriff of that county, by the presence of a small regiment of troops, not exceeding four hundred in number, which has now been reduced to less than one hundred and fifty.

The details of relief upon the ground at Johnstown were conducted, first, under the auspices of the Pittsburg Committee,

and afterwards under the supervision of the Adjutant-General of Pennsylvania. This entire work has now been transferred to the hands of the citizens of this region, who are undoubtedly able to conduct it successfully in the future. The police work of the State will be carried on under the direction and the immediate supervision of the secretary of the State Board of Health.

If the fidelity, discretion, and devotion of the Commission having charge of the distribution of the great charity herein referred to shall be, in any degree, equal to the generosity which has prompted it, the full measure of the hopes of its members will be reached, and the desires of the donors and recipients of the funds fully met when this work has been completed. This is not to be expected. The members of the Commission are human, but this charity, so sublime in its proportions, and so beautiful in its inception, is something more than human.

JAMES A. BEAVER.

PHILANTHROPY AT JOHNSTOWN.

BY CLARA BARTON, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS.

THE DIFFICULTIES attendant upon relief work at the field—and I have no experience in any other—can scarcely surpass that of attempting to record them in any collected or intelligible manner. The work of relief committees for the alleviation of distress resulting from great disasters must necessarily be two-fold. One part is the raising of funds and preparing of material among the people at home, which admits of the most perfect and methodical system, and hence can be thoroughly learned and transmitted from call to call. But for those who go to the scene itself to learn the needs, and, to some extent, receive and apply the contributions sent, it is quite another affair. Perhaps one of the chief difficulties to be encountered in the administration of relief at the scenes of disaster or need lies in the variety which it must assume in order to meet the ever-changing features presented. One can only adapt measures and invent methods; yet it is to be remembered that the principle of adaptation amounts almost to a science, and can be studied.

Of the twelve fields* on which the officers of the American Red Cross have operated since its organization in 1881, and borne a part more or less prominent, no two have been the same in general character, and only three or four in any manner similar. Yet it would probably be difficult to throw these people *hors du combat* in any field which they could reach; and much depends upon the ability to reach a field in time for greatest use. True, it is seldom that a body of victims are so completely cut off, not only from the help of the world, but from the world itself, as the fated resi-

* Forest fires of Michigan, 1881; Mississippi floods, 1882; Ohio floods, 1883; Mississippi cyclone, 1883; Ohio flood, 1884; Mississippi flood, 1884; Virginia epidemic, 1885; Texas drought, 1887; Charleston earthquake, 1887; Mount Vernon cyclone, 1888; yellow fever in Florida, 1888; Conemaugh Valley floods, 1889.

dents of the Conemaugh Valley. The first despatches of Saturday were so wild in statement as to throw a doubt over their veracity. Sunday morning made it evident at Red Cross headquarters in Washington that the field must be reached if possible. The Potomac spread itself over Pennsylvania Avenue, and the Baltimore and Potomac station was reached only in boats. The Philadelphia auxiliary society was telegraphed to in the hope that it could find a way of reaching the ground direct. On Sunday evening we started for Baltimore, ordering all communications to be sent to Harrisburg, as probably the nearest point to be reached. The Pennsylvania Railroad was a sealed book, and so were our despatches and mails, two weeks elapsing before we got them, and we were from Sunday until Wednesday morning in going from Washington to Johnstown, and this by the first train.

The few houses left, being mainly upside down, were not habitable, and a place in a car was retained till a camp could be selected and tents unpacked and erected, which our resolute Philadelphians were not long in accomplishing. This was their first experience at the field, and although they were surgeons and physicians, equipped with all the fine instruments for surgery, I counted the blisters on their hands left by the shovels and axe-handles in pitching tents and digging trenches. The rain fell in continuous torrents. Access from the west had been more fortunate, and Pittsburg and Ohio were towers of strength to these bewildered wrecks of human beings. The town being under military control, it was, by nature of its international treaty, obligatory upon the Red Cross to report directly to the military officer in command. Headquarters were two miles from our camp; mountains of wreckage obstructed every pass way; the horses of the town were mostly lying dead along the banks. It remained only to make one's way in mud over boot-top and rain over head; but the cordial welcome of the gallant General Hastings, in command, and his genial neighbor, Axline, of Ohio, would have richly repaid a more difficult journey, if it had been possible to perform one. Other relief societies from the West were already arriving, and establishing quarters for work. Great depots of supplies were opened and filling up, and the crowds and lines of applicants swaying in front of the wide-open doors told a pitiful tale of want and woe. Here were arriving the supplies so systematically gathered and gloriously sent from the home relief, to whom their

indiscriminate outpouring would doubtless have seemed sacrilegious waste. In the first dreadful moments, this was scarcely to be avoided; but the struggle comes in the herculean effort which must later be made to correct and discriminate in all this wholesale distribution.

It is probable that no other problem is so difficult to solve. No question has lain more heavily on the hearts and brains of good men; for it has been mainly men who have had these matters in charge, and more than one, perplexed and discouraged in his unaccustomed rôle, has said to me, with a sad shake of the head: "But this is work of which women should have charge; we men are wasteful." And as often as I have heard this, my own heart has been touched by the unskilled and patient efforts which these men were making to do this kind of woman's work. Time and experience will later point a remedy for this state of things. Great advances have been made even in the last ten years.

No sooner was the terrible loss of life realized than the mother hearts turned to the little children. Every aid society in the land stirred its sleeping embers, and a perfect blaze of orphan-aid burst out over the entire country. All who could, sent deputations to gather up the orphans who were supposed to be wandering and crying in herds about the town. Others opened great places of refuge in city and country to receive them for either permanent or transient care, and every family that could arrange to take in a child wrote to some one on the spot to get one for them, to be sent by express or any safe conveyance to some point where it could be met; often the color of the eyes designated, the disposition specified, and the point urged that it be of good family. It is safe to say that applications for several thousands of these little waifs have been received in the mails of the Red Cross alone, which was known not to be in any connection with this feature of the work. What must it have been for those who were? and how difficult for them, as for us, to write continually to these good, tender-hearted people that there were no orphans in Johnstown—certainly not more than in ordinary times; that the same foe that swept the parents in full strength did not spare the helpless children! I have pitied the mistaken efforts of orphan-aid societies, for I knew that the noble representatives and workers they had sent here had blotted the pages with tears as day after day they wrote out the pitiful refrain:

"There are no orphans here; the children are dead, save the few that have been carried through the waters of death by miracle, whose friends cannot give them up."

Another mistake growing out of an illusion of a very similar nature has been that of the prevalence of sickness and wounds, and the consequent need of great numbers of physicians and nurses. The same argument applies here as to the children; the weak ones could not outlast the fatigue and exposure of days and nights in the water, climbing and leaping from wreck to wreck, crushing and grinding between floating timbers, iron girders, and even driving engines plowing through the waters twenty feet beneath them. These went down from exhaustion, even if not wounded. Those who were hit and disabled found the second foe waiting. The water took them where the wounds left them, and between the two the end came; and even if there might have been in some instances an escape from a place of security sought on floating wreckage, the fire crept in—the third foe—and the most terrible of all deaths ensued. Thus it became literally a "survival of the fittest." The chronic invalids and the weak were mainly gone; those remaining were the strong, healthy, and vigorous. The excitement and constant exertion for life prevented colds and harm from exposure, and the rates of illness of any kind resulting from the flood have been marvellously small.

The epidemics and typhoids which have really cast a shadow over the whole country have never existed here. Up to this time there may have been some cases with typhoid symptoms, but that would be possible in any place and under any circumstances. I should doubt if to-day there is, or at any time since the flood has been, any greater percentage of illness than would have been the case if no catastrophe had taken place. Some local physicians were lost and all were broken up in their practice, but the survivors are trying to get on their feet again. Volunteers from abroad are endeavoring to do the work gratuitously while there is no money to pay for medical attendance, and thus to hold the practice for the resident physicians when they shall be ready to take it. Even this has been misunderstood and sent out to the world as a great strife between the local and volunteer physicians. The truth is, they are excellent friends; no paying case of a local physician is touched by any volunteer, or in any way taken from his hands, and the Philadelphia surgeons, at least, have labored assiduously

to restore the instruments and medical outfit lost by the town physicians. The Red Cross physicians established several small hospital tents at first, and later they consolidated them in one good hospital, where excellent work is being done. They have had their difficulties and met them manfully, and, as young physicians, have learned some practical lessons in field work. The proffer of volunteer help from physicians and nurses so abundantly tendered has been most creditable to both as valuable classes of the community.

After all, it is, perhaps, the vast contributions of money and material around which the greater interest clusters, and in the dispensation of which the greater skill is required and the greater danger to be faced. To the worthy committees of Johnstown citizens who have been made the custodians of the vast sums contributed within the last five weeks for the relief of this valley too much manly and womanly sympathy cannot be extended. Many of them have seen their last dollar of earthly possessions swept from their grasp, and, side by side with the poor laborers whom they once employed, have dug day and night among the wrecks for some trace of the wife, son, or daughter, or all three, whom they believed to be crushed and buried beneath the ruins, and would fain take to a more fitting sepulchre. What absurdity to doubt that these men have the best good of their stricken neighbors at heart! What cruelty to suspect them! And yet before they are through with their task, their ears will hear these criticisms, and their weary souls will many times yearn for the peaceful rest that has come to their loved and lost.

It is always thus. I have never known it fail, and it comes to me over and over to doubt the wisdom and humanity of making the citizens of an afflicted town the custodians of the means contributed towards relief and restitution; to question whether it were not more kind and humane, and equally just, to place all this duty in the hands of a competent committee of strangers who are not to reside among the people; who, being perfectly disinterested, cannot be harmed by complaints and accusations. Indeed, would not the complaints be fewer, and the satisfaction more general, if these leading citizens, so needed among the people, should be left to them in good faith and confidence, to lead and advise them as they have been wont to do? But as is generally the case, the citizens who serve on the committee are forever lost to the

people through the scandal and distrust which the greed of the ignorant populace brings upon them. Of the little dissensions and jealousies, State, city, town, and otherwise, mainly growing out of ambition and what in women would be vanity, I have nothing to say, but much to hope for, when it all shall have worked itself clear and settled down to good steady purpose. These committees find difficulties enough which require no pointing-out in order to be seen. Coming nearer home, our own work pictures itself in bright relief to my gaze as having met few difficulties, thus far, which hard work, patience, and the exercise of the best judgment possessed could not overcome.

As previously mentioned, the Red Cross here has consisted of a two-fold force—a portion of the National Association from its headquarters at Washington, with valuable acquisitions in the persons of its members drawn from over the United States. Of these we have called nearly a score for the sake of their aid and counsel. The second force, consisting of the Branch Society of the Red Cross of Philadelphia, has brought to its aid some forty or more persons, mainly physicians and nurses, and has held a valuable commissary department, distributing largely. It would be gratifying to mention by name some of the ladies and gentlemen whose volunteer service the labors of these few weeks have called to our aid, and of whom it might literally be said that it was a liberal education to know them. One whose privilege it is to preside over assistants like these is humbled to the dust by praise tendered for effort or success : with such lieutenants as gather to the national standard of the Red Cross, what captain could fail ?

But there were some perplexities, not to say trials, as, for instance, before one had a dry corner of a box on which to transact business the mails commenced to bring in a hundred letters and telegrams per day, containing checks, drafts, money-orders, postal notes, orders to draw, and money by the United States Express, American Express, and Adams Express. The banks had all gone down stream, the safes were in the bottom of the Conemaugh, half the business men dead, our desk a dry-goods box turned sidewise, our combination-lock the tangled strings that drew together the sides of a flyless tent flapping and swaying in the wind. The Western Union was so overcrowded that despatches were often twenty-four hours late. But if thanks went for anything, if words were of any avail, what would one try to say of the tire-

less courtesy of its worn-down clerks? Sleepless, vigilant, weary, and faint, they toiled on, stimulated, one knows, by the great-hearted, generous example above them, which bids them ever, in the name of humanity, to count all loss as gain, so the afflicted are comforted and the needy find a friend. The consolation and safeguard was that steady-browed stenographer with her hundred and seventy words a minute.

Checks were not immediately available, but express funds came to the rescue; and before even a tent was prepared the material commenced to arrive from every source—boxes, barrels, trunks, baskets, bundles, car-loads. Letters upon letters told that such and such boxes had been sent, special distribution desired in special ways, and "Please acknowledge as soon as received." Every station and express office were thronged with similar freight—perhaps thousands of packages every day—and a dozen commissaries were open, with thrifty agents and active drivers claiming their goods immediately for distribution. The teams drove up with a score or more of ponderous boxes and barrels all marked to the President of the Red Cross, at Johnstown, Pennsylvania; but from nowhere, if one shall except Philadelphia, with the distinctive regulation sign which would have insured safety. Then commenced the search to find who had sent all this. Often not a modest word, not even a pencil-mark, or a mere pencil-mark, if anything, and no intimation of what it contained. How shall it be "acknowledged as soon as received"? You want immediately some sheets and bedding for some one who waits, and you commence on one of these boxes. After the labor of a man is expended, and five minutes consumed, you discover that the box contains dresses and shoes. Attack another—men's clothing; another—sundries, dried fruit, pickles; another—canned goods, condensed milk, rice, and ground coffee, the two latter broken open and sifted through. The weary, waiting woman is tired, and so are you, and you give up the search, call off your men, and resolve to tell all givers in the land before you sleep to place their address plainly, and a schedule of contents, on the outside of every package of relief goods ever sent.

Soon the anxious letters commence to arrive asking if "our boxes are received." You presume they are, but are not quite certain by whom. Every agent or employee indignantly affirms that he "never took anything with a red cross on it to his head-

quarters"; and so one believes. These are difficulties which, if not quite surmountable, have at least been borne, and will lessen in time. This necessary display of opening all boxes at once, whether needed at the moment or not, gave to youthful and unaccustomed eyes, more likely to look among storehouses and headquarters than the crowded haunts of the people in the mud and on the ground, the impression of far more material than was actually here; and forgetting the appalling fact that twenty thousand people were to be supplied over and over with every necessary of life, they were misled, formed hasty and damaging conclusions, and before two weeks had passed the reports went out to all the country that there was nothing more needed at Johnstown—they could not use what they already had in two years, and no more should be sent. Poor, dazed, speechless, uncomplaining, homeless, frightened, and bereft! weary mourners digging in the river banks, watching in the morgues! poor Johnstown! poor fifty miles of Conemaugh! Who has named your spokesman? who has appointed your guardians? Then doubled the letters on our desks. "Is it true, what we read? Can all be supplied so soon? Must we hold our goods or money? Can you make no use of them or us in all that region? Tell us at once, we beg of you." Then came need for two stenographers, that one be not worn out; and here they are day and night; and here is a woman's brain, busy with houses, lots, workmen, workwomen, trains, lumber, and applicants of all descriptions, dictating in hurried snatches this crude, disconnected article, which must be left where and as it is, to the mercy of the magnanimous and forgiving; for the work is at its height and cannot be told until accomplished.

For an impression of the interesting personality of this individual, the readers must be referred to the illustrations so profusely placed before them in the great journals of the day—namely, a chubby face and form, curly hair, fixed smile beaming with *un*intelligence, affecting a nurse's cap, neatly-folded kerchief, regulation dress, and benignly bearing a teacup. Alas! I am dreadfully afraid she does not always wear that becoming smile; is too hard worked and hard thought for a plump, chubby face and figure; that the regulation suit and nurse's cap would suffer in two-weeks' rain and mud; and as for the teacup—

CLARA BARTON.

THE LESSON OF CONEMAUGH.

BY MAJOR J. W. POWELL, DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

THE experiences of civilization teach many lessons that go unheeded until some great disaster comes as an object-lesson to recall to men's minds things known but half-forgotten. The Conemaugh disaster belongs to this category. For more than four thousand years civilized men have been constructing reservoirs in which to store water for various purposes. The conditions to be fulfilled in their construction are well known, for the lesson has been enforced upon mankind from the dawn of civilization to the present time by disasters too many to be enumerated.

Hydraulic engineering is the oldest scientific art. No other can compare with it in this respect, except that of architecture in its application to the building of temples and pyramids; but scientific engineering is even older than scientific architecture. Everywhere throughout the world civilization began in arid lands, and hydraulic engineering was the first great problem to be solved; and for this reason it was solved at an early time, and well solved. Something has been added through the years, but not much. In our own times these problems have come to be of far greater importance than they were in antiquity, and the civilized world has now reached the dawn of a day of hydraulic engineering of such magnitude that all the works hitherto accomplished are insignificant compared to those now to be planned and executed. Let the significance of this statement be briefly set forth.

One of the purposes for which hydraulic engineering has been prosecuted in late civilization is the utilization of powers otherwise running to waste. For a time a check has been given to this form of development by the introduction of steam, but at present the great transition in modern industries is from the employment of muscular power to the employment of the physical powers of nature, and it is probable that the resort to water-power will rapidly increase in the immediate

future. It certainly will if the dream of modern electrical science is realized, so that water-power can be economically converted into electric power and transported from place to place. If this is done,—and its accomplishment is hardly to be considered Utopian,—all our highland streams will immediately become of value as powers, and dams and reservoirs must be constructed in far greater numbers than in the past.

Modern sanitary science condemns well water for domestic purposes in cities, towns, and villages. Disease is at the bottom of a well ; health in the waters of the heavens ; and the people must have this pure water. The demand for highland waters for such purposes is rapidly increasing. The speedy development of city and town life under the new industrial conditions makes this one of the most important uses to which water can be applied. Wherever the houses of men are clustered reservoirs or systems of reservoirs must be built. Nothing can be more certain than that the storage of water for this purpose will greatly and quickly increase throughout the United States.

Along the course of every river there is a flood-plain of greater or less width. This is the plane established by the sediment washed from the hills and upper country and deposited along the course of the river outside of its low-water channel, but within the area covered by water at the time of greatest floods. These greatest floods are infrequent, and are not coincident with the annual floods, but much higher. The plane of the ordinary flood is much lower than this great flood-plain, which is established by the maximum floods, occurring ten, twenty, or even fifty years apart. Such flood-plains are the most fertile lands, and always tempt the agriculturist. Yet torrents sweep over them from time to time, destroying property in vast amounts, and even life. In lands already highly cultivated, densely populated, and of great value, protection from floods has come to be an important problem. One, and only one, method of protection is possible : the flood waters must be stored and allowed to find their way to the sea during times of low water. The preservation of lands in this manner accomplishes another end, as the navigable streams are improved thereby. Great floods destroy low-water channels by blocking them with natural dams. By storing the water of such floods, and discharging it during low-water time, these channels are kept open and a more equable volume is preserved.

There is another use to which flood waters are put. Experience has shown that they contain vast stores of fertilizing elements. All other fertilizers that man can utilize sink into insignificance when compared with those furnished by flood waters. In highly-civilized and densely-populated lands this source of fertilization is already used, and it will be used more and more as the years go by. In the United States we are just beginning to appreciate this. The conditions under which agricultural operations have hitherto been carried on have not directed the attention of our farmers to this subject until of late years. It is far within the facts to state that any region of our country may have its agricultural production doubled by the use of its flowing waters for the fertilization of the lands. The time is rapidly coming when the flood waters of the country will be used for this purpose on a grand scale, and reservoirs will be constructed all over the land, as they are now in process of building in England, Germany, France, Italy, and other countries.

About two-fifths of the area of the United States is so arid that agriculture is impossible without artificial irrigation, the rainfall being insufficient for the fertilization of ordinary crops. In this region all agriculture depends upon the use of running streams. In all of this country, wherever agriculture is prosecuted, dams must be constructed, and the waters spread upon the lands through the agency of canals. Again, as the season of growing crops is comparatively short,—in most of the country it lasts from two to three months only,—the waters of the non-irrigating season will run to waste unless they are stored in reservoirs. Already the storing of these waters is begun; the people are constructing reservoirs, and will continue the process until all of the streams of the arid region are wholly utilized in this manner, so that no waste water runs to the sea. Less than a third of the streams of the arid region run to the sea, even now, as the great majority are "lost rivers." A little further explanation is necessary to understand how these waters are to be utilized.

The arid region is mountainous. Mountain ranges enclose valleys, while plains, mesas, and plateaus carry dead volcanoes on their backs. The precipitation of moisture on these lands is confined to the mountains, where it is excessive. The fertile lands along the plains and mountains are arid. In all the region agriculture is possible only by collecting the mountain waters and

using them on the plains and valleys. Wherever a farm, a village, or a city is made, hydraulic works are necessary, and dams must be constructed and reservoirs built. Considering the whole country at large, its hydraulic industries are gigantic. In the region of country where land is more abundant than water, the value inheres in the water, not in the land. Land, like air, is found in greater quantities than can be used ; water is the necessary, and value is given to the land by the water-right which it carries ; if the water-right is dissevered, the land is valueless. These are not unfavorable conditions for agriculture, however. The farmer's industry is more attractive and more profitable in an arid than a humid region. All of the early civilization of the world began in arid lands, and the best agriculture of the world to-day is carried on by means of artificial irrigation. The seemingly-desert plains of the arid region of the West are, in fact, abundantly rich when watered artificially. The gentle storms of a humid region fructify the land, but its tempests drown vegetation. In such regions the planting season is now too dry and now too wet, and many a prospectively-rich harvest has been destroyed by a harvest-time storm. Agriculture in arid lands is not subject to these vicissitudes. The mountains catch the floods, while the valleys are fertilized by the hand of man, who turns the waters upon them at his will. At the day and hour he pleases he spreads the water upon his garden, his vineyard, or his field in quantities governed by his judgment. When harvest time comes, he reaps his field with a mind free from the fear of storms. Ultimately one of the great agricultural regions of this country will be found in the irrigated plains and valleys of the West. Sage-brush plains, sand-dune deserts, and alkaline valleys will be covered by gardens, fields, and groves, all perennially fertilized from thousands of mountain lakes.

Enough has been said to show that the storage of water in reservoirs is not one of the trivial incidents of modern industry, but one of its most important factors, and that in this country we have only reached the beginning of its development. We may expect, in the course of a few generations, that all the highland streams of America will be controlled and utilized, and that the floods will be bridled and become the trained servants of man, as wild beasts have been domesticated for his use.

In view of these facts, it is only the thoughtless man, governed by the impulse of the hour, and dragged from the throne of his

reason by the emotions which arise at human suffering, who will believe that the vast industries which have been mentioned must be stopped because hydraulic power, when improperly controlled, may become an agent of destruction. Badly-constructed houses may fall and overwhelm families, but no check to the construction of houses will be made thereby. Fires will cause conflagration, yet homes will be warmed. Bridges may give way and trains leap into the abyss, yet bridges will be erected. Cars will leave the track and plunge travellers over embankments, but railroads will be operated. Dams will give way and waters overwhelm the people of the valley below, but dams will still be built.

What lesson, then, is there in the Conemaugh disaster? Nothing new to scientific engineering, but a very old lesson, that must needs be taught to mankind again and again. From the accounts which have appeared in the scientific journals, it seems that the dam was properly constructed. Earth dams are more common than all others. Most of the dams constructed for four thousand years have been, in all essential particulars, like that at Conemaugh. Where, then, was the trouble? In the construction of the dam there was a total neglect to consider the first and fundamental problem—the duty the dam was required to perform. The works were not properly related to the natural conditions, and so a lake was made at Conemaugh which was for a long time a menace to the people below, and at last swept them to destruction.

When the construction of such a dam is proposed, the first thing to be done is to determine the amount of water to be controlled and the rate at which it will be delivered to the reservoir under maximum conditions of rainfall or snow-melting. The proper method of procedure is to determine, first, the area of the drainage basin supplying the reservoir; second, the declivities of the supplying basin.

The very first thing, then, is a topographic survey.

The second need is a hydrographic survey.

The precipitation in rain and snow over the basin must be determined as an average from year to year, and also the maximum precipitation at the times of great flood. This must be supplemented by the gauging of streams to determine their average volume and maximum volumes. All of these factors are necessary and preliminary to the construction of a safe and efficient reservoir system by making mountain lakes. Before a reservoir

dam is constructed, it is of prime importance to determine what will be required of it. With these facts ascertained, the engineer can easily plan works adequate to control the forces involved; he can readily determine how much water he can store, and what waste-way will be necessary to discharge the surplus.

The art of dam-construction is quite within the grasp of every intelligent engineer. In the case of solid masonry dams, the waste-way is over the whole surface of the dam, as at the Great Falls of the Potomac, where a dam has been constructed to divert the water into the reservoirs that supply Washington. But masonry dams are few; earth dams, and those related to them, are many, and, with these, special waste-ways must be provided, adequate to meet all possible emergencies. The rules for their construction are well known, and have been known for tens of centuries. In American engineering, that which has been most neglected is a precise determination of the duty of the dam,—the conditions which it must fulfil or else be destroyed. These can be determined only by a topographic survey, which gives the area of the drainage basin and its grade-curves. To this must be added a hydrographic survey, which may have to extend over some years. It is not necessary that this survey in all its parts should be over each basin where a reservoir is to be constructed. The average and maximum rate of precipitation may be determined for large regions, and the general facts used for the several cases, always allowing a margin for safety. But the topographic survey and the stream-gauging are essential to each individual basin.

There are other factors to be determined that are important to persons engaged in constructing reservoirs for industrial purposes. Two may be mentioned here. The streams feeding the reservoir should be gauged for the purpose of determining the amount of sediment they carry, in order that the life of the reservoirs may be known, or that the proper engineering appliances may be devised to discharge such sediment; and the rate of evaporation should be ascertained, so as to know how much water is lost thereby.

In the construction of reservoirs in the arid region there are important problems not pertaining to humid regions. To a large extent the sources of the water are in high mountains, where the chief precipitation is snow, which, to some extent, stores itself in snow-banks and glacial fields, to be melted by the summer sun at the time when irrigation is required. The upper portions of

these mountains are largely treeless—a condition favorable to the storage of snow. In a forest region the snows are evenly distributed over the entire surface, and are quickly melted when the summer rains and suns come ; but in a treeless region the snows are accumulated in great drifts in the lee of rocks and cliffs and under the walls of gorges and canyons. Such great drifts are themselves stupendous reservoirs of water, and artificial works are necessary only to control the flow properly and distribute the water at the places and times needed. Wherever the chief precipitation is snow, forests are a disadvantage if the waters are needed in the valleys below for irrigation, for the forests keep the snow distributed over broad areas of ground and expose it to the winds on their trunks, branches, and leaves, so that altogether the mountain evaporation is enormously increased as compared with the evaporation from snow-drifts and ice-fields. On the other hand, in low mountain and hilly regions of humid lands, forests about the sources of the streams are of advantage in two ways : the water being in excess, increased evaporation is advantageous ; and the forests serve to hold back the water and thus equalize the flow through the year and greatly mitigate the floods.

Whether forests increase the amount of rainfall has long been discussed, and lately it has been the subject of careful scientific investigation. The outcome of all this research is that, if forests do, in fact, increase rainfall, it is to such a slight extent that our present means of investigation are not sufficiently refined to prove it.

Such are the facts to be collected as preliminary to the construction of a reservoir system. To neglect the essential facts is to be guilty of criminal neglect. The history of mountain-lake construction, throughout all the countries of engineering enterprise, is full of lessons like that taught at Conemaugh, and the lessons have always been enforced by the destruction of property and life ; they have always been emphasized by dire disaster. Modern industries are handling the forces of nature on a stupendous scale. The coal-fields of the world are now on fire to work for man ; chemical forces, as giant explosives, are used as his servants ; the lightnings are harnessed and floods are tamed. Woe to the people who trust these powers to the hands of fools ! Then wealth is destroyed, homes are overwhelmed, and loved ones killed.

J. W. POWELL.

A WORD WITH PROFESSOR HUXLEY.

BY THE REV. LYMAN ABBOTT, D.D., PASTOR OF PLYMOUTH CHURCH, BROOKLYN.

IN A SERIES of articles which Professor Huxley has been contributing to the *Nineteenth Century* on Agnosticism, he has furnished what seem to me to be two quite different, if not wholly inconsistent, definitions of the term. If any one ought to know what the word Agnostic means, surely he should; for it originated with him, and he gives in the first of these articles a humorous account of its origin.

"When I reached intellectual maturity and began to ask myself whether I was an atheist, a theist, or a panthlist; a materialist or an idealist; a Christian or a free-thinker, I found that the more I learned and reflected, the less ready was the answer; until, at last, I came to the conclusion that I had neither art nor part with any of these denominations, except the last. The one thing in which most of these good people were agreed was the one thing in which I differed from them. They were quite sure they had attained a certain 'gnosis,'—had, more or less successfully, solved the problem of existence; while I was quite sure I had not, and had a pretty strong conviction that the problem was insoluble. . . . This was my situation when I had the good fortune to find a place among the members of that remarkable confraternity of antagonists, long since deceased, but of green and pious memory, the Metaphysical Society. Every variety of philosophical and theological opinion was represented there, and expressed itself with entire openness; most of my colleagues were -ists of one sort or another; and, however kind and friendly they might be, I, the man without a rag of a label to cover himself with, could not fail to have some of the uneasy feelings which must have beset the historical fox when, after leaving the trap in which his tail remained, he presented himself to his normally-elongated companions. So I took thought, and invented what I conceived to be the appropriate title of 'agnostic.' It came into my head as suggestively antithetic to the 'gnostic' of church history, who professed to know so much about the very things of which I was ignorant; and I took the earliest opportunity of parading it at our Society, to show that I, too, had a tail, like the other foxes. To my great satisfaction, the term took, and when the *Spectator* had stood godfather to it, any suspicion in the mind of respectable people that a knowledge of its parentage might have awakened was, of course, completely lulled."

If this is a correct definition of Agnosticism; if an Agnostic is one who believes that knowledge is necessarily imperfect and fragmentary; that no one can furnish a complete, comprehensive, and satisfying interpretation of the universe; that "we know in

part, and we prophesy in part," certainly Paul was an Agnostic, and it is no discredit for one who believes in the Pauline theology to confess himself an Agnostic also. One may even rejoice at the good work which avowed Agnostics have done in teaching that there are limits to religious thought, even if he does not consent to set the same rules and bonds to the human intellect; at least he may recognize in current Agnosticism a natural and not altogether unhealthy reaction against the self-conceited dogmatism which undertakes, at once, to furnish a universal knowledge of spiritual things and to excommunicate all who decline to accept the system furnished them ready made. But after writing two articles which attack the Christian faith in the Christian revelation, Professor Huxley seems to come to the conclusion that the definition which he has afforded of Agnosticism is insufficient to serve as a point of advantage for his attack on Christian believers; and, apparently in naïve unconsciousness that he has shifted his ground, he suddenly furnishes, in an off-hand and quite incidental manner, a new and radically different definition of Agnosticism.

"Agnosticism is not properly described as a 'negative' creed, nor, indeed, as a creed of any kind, except in so far as it expresses absolute faith in the validity of a principle which is as much ethical as intellectual. This principle may be stated in various ways, but they all amount to this: that it is wrong for a man to say that he is certain of the truth of any proposition, unless he can produce evidence which logically justifies that certainty. This is what Agnosticism asserts; and, in my opinion, it is all that is essential to Agnosticism. That which Agnostics deny and repudiate as immoral is the contrary doctrine, that there are propositions which men ought to believe without logical scientific evidence."

These two definitions, it is evident, are not the same; they are not even similar; they have no particular relation to each other. An Agnostic is one who believes that all knowledge is imperfect and fragmentary; that we know, for example, the essence of neither matter nor spirit, but only the qualities and relations of each. Then I acknowledge myself an Agnostic. An Agnostic is one who says that all certainty is based on the logical faculty. Then I am not an Agnostic.

Accepting Mr. Huxley's second definition as the correct one, I desire to put clearly before the reader of these pages the two contrasted conceptions of the human mind—the Gnostic and the Agnostic. For it is evident that the issue between them is primarily philosophic, not religious; it is a question, not of what we ought to do, but of what we can know; it relates primarily to

our ability, only secondarily to our duty ; it is psychological, not ethical.

Over against Mr. Huxley's Agnostic principle, then,—that the soul can obtain certainty only by evidence which logically justifies that certainty,—I desire to put the contrary, and, if the reader pleases, the Gnostic, principle—that there are propositions which men ought to believe without logically-satisfying evidence. This, undoubtedly, the Gnostics believe, and this Gnostic belief I frankly confess to be my personal profound conviction.

To illustrate the Gnostic position in the first instance by an illustration to which no theological prejudices can attach, I turn to Mark Twain's "Tramp Abroad," and quote from that Gnostic philosopher, albeit it is probable that when he wrote he was quite unconscious whether he was a Gnostic or an Agnostic.

"In conversation with an artist in Venice, I asked, What is it that people see in the Old Masters? I have been in the Doge's Palace, and I saw several acres of very bad drawing, very bad perspective, and very incorrect proportions. . . . The artist said, 'Yes, the Old Masters often drew badly; they did not care much for truth and exactness in minor details. But after all, in spite of bad drawing, bad proportion, bad perspective, and a choice of subjects which no longer appeal to people as strongly as they did three hundred years ago, there is a something about these pictures which is divine,—a something which is above the art of any epoch since,—a something which would be the despair of artists, but that they do not hope or expect to attain it, and therefore do not worry about it.' That is what he said, and he said what he believed; and not only believed, but felt. Reasoning—especially reasoning without technical knowledge—must be put aside in cases of this kind. It cannot assist the inquirer. It will lead him in the most logical progression to what in the eyes of artists would be a most illogical conclusion. Thus: bad drawing, bad proportion, bad perspective, indifference to truthful detail, color which gets its merit from time—these things constitute the Old Master; conclusion, the Old Master was a bad painter, the Old Master was not an Old Master at all, but an Old Apprentice. Your friend the artist will grant your premises, but deny your conclusions; he will maintain that, notwithstanding this formidable list of confessed defects, there is still a something that is divine and unapproachable about the Old Masters, and that there is no arguing the fact away by any system of reasoning whatever.

"I can believe that. There are women who have an indefinable charm in their faces which makes them beautiful to their intimates ; but a cold stranger who tried to reason the matter out and find this beauty would fail. He would say of one of these women, 'This chin is too short, this nose is too long, this forehead is too high, this hair is too red, this complexion is too palid, the perspective of the entire composition is incorrect ; conclusion, the woman is not beautiful.' But her nearest friend might say, and say truly, Your premises are right, your logic faultless, but your conclusion is wrong nevertheless ; she is an Old Master,—she is beautiful, but only to such as know her ; it is a beauty which cannot be formulated, but it is there just the same."

The reader will pardon so long a quotation. But it states the Gnostic position with great clearness; and as a testimony it is more valuable since it may be safely assumed that the writer had no idea of contributing anything to a philosophical discussion, or

of ranking himself with either one of two conflicting schools. He supposed himself to be uttering a truth which any one would recognize; and it may be added that any one not in a controversial mood probably would recognize the truth of his utterance. And yet if we are to apply to it Mr. Huxley's principle of Agnosticism, both the artist, in stating that he is certain that there is a divine beauty in the Old Masters, and Mark Twain, in asserting that he is certain that there is a beauty in a homely woman, are not only mistaken, but immoral, since each says that he is certain of the objective truth of a proposition, and yet cannot produce evidence which logically justifies that certainty.

At all events, this quotation will, perhaps, suffice better than any argumentative statement of my own could do to make clear the radical difference between Agnostic and Gnostic. The Agnostic believes that all certainty enters the human mind through the logical faculty, and that it is immoral to assume certainty for any truth not certified by evidence which logically justifies that certainty. Gnostics, on the contrary, avow that there are other doors than the logical faculty by which certainty enters the human mind; that there are absolute convictions which are certified by evidence which the logical faculty is incompetent to certify. It believes with Pascal "that the heart has reasons of its own which the reason knows nothing of." It believes that the soul is furnished with a sixth sense, a super-sensible faculty, sometimes called faith, sometimes called imagination, sometimes called insight, which gives direct and immediate cognizance of invisible and spiritual truths that neither the senses nor the logical faculty can perceive. It is this sixth sense in the artist which sees the divine something which the mere mechanic or even the mere critic cannot see; which in the friend discerns beneath the features of the pure and noble woman a beauty which the sculptor's art cannot imitate and the sun cannot copy. The Gnostic sees a golden beauty in a field of daisies, while the Agnostic farmer sees only a weed that impairs the hay crop. The Gnostic hears in the strains of the organ or the orchestra a spiritual voice speaking,—the voice of Beethoven, Schumann, or Wagner,—while the Agnostic, closing all doors of the soul to truth except the door of logic, hears only so many violins, 'cellos, flutes, and brass instruments, or, at best, certain extraordinary chords and combinations to be scientifically studied

and critically analyzed. The Gnostic does not—at least he ought not to—imitate the dogmatism of the Agnostic by declaring that it is immoral to deny that we can be certain of the objective truth of propositions without logical evidence to certify them. He pities, rather than condemns, the man who is deficient in the faculty of spiritual vision. He looks upon him as one who, having eyes, sees not, and, having ears, hears not. But he declares with great and growing positiveness of conviction that this philosophy, which denies to man all faculty of discernment except the logical faculty, and all certainty of truth except that which logic ratifies, is narrow and unscientific; and if not in itself immoral, and if held, as it certainly is, by some men of pure and lofty ethical natures, yet would, if it were ever generally adopted, dissolve the very foundations of the moral life.

For there is no evidence which logically justifies the moral certainties on which modern society is built. If Professor Huxley were to attempt by a logical process to convince a South Sea Islander that cannibalism is wrong, he would certainly be eaten up as soon as he had completed his demonstration. His only hope would be to develop a moral faculty which would, without the aid of logic or the reënforcement of evidence, perceive the moral hatefulness of the practice. When a convict is sent up to the Elmira Reformatory, Mr. Brockway, the distinguished superintendent, does not begin with a course in philosophy to render more acute the logical faculty of the Agnostic before him, who is not certain that it is wrong to steal because he has had no evidence which justifies that certainty. He gives the man a bath, and puts him in the workshops, and under moral discipline. He sets to work to develop in the convict a moral habit out of which will grow in time a clear moral perception. The man who relies on evidence to justify the certainty that robbery and murder are immoral is a very unsafe neighbor. In fact, it is doubtful whether there is any evidence which will suffice in a purely logical mind to produce that certainty. Why shall I not lie? Because it will injure my neighbor? But there is not always evidence which will justify the certainty that it will injure my neighbor. Is it, then, uncertain whether it is wrong to lie in such cases? No! Not according to Mr. Huxley, whose condemnation of lying in the interest of good morals I heartily agree with. But, even supposing lying always did injure my neighbor,

why should I not lie if it will benefit myself? What evidence is there which will justify the certainty either that lying will always be an injury to me, or that there is any obligation on my part to abstain from it when it will be a benefit to me? The evidence is in the soul itself; in its own moral perception of the beauty of truth and the hatefulness of lying. If any man has not a soul which perceives this beauty and its deformity, the remedy is not new evidence addressed to the logical faculty, but a new soul; or, if this be thought too theological a phrase, then such a course of instruction as will develop the now rudimentary faculty of conscience.

It will not be expected that in such an article as this I should enter into any argument for the Gnostic philosophy; I content myself here simply with accepting the challenge which Professor Huxley has thrown down, and saying for myself, and I rather think I may say it also for the great mass of Christian believers, that we deny his axiom "that it is wrong for any man to say that he is confident of the objective truth of any proposition unless he can produce evidence which logically justifies that certainty." We avow, on the contrary, that the highest certainties, those on which all æsthetic, all domestic, all political and national life are based,—the certainties of the moral and spiritual realm,—are attested, not by the logical faculty at all, but by an entirely different faculty, by a power of direct moral and spiritual vision. These spiritual certainties are no more dependent on the logical faculty than is the certainty of those material phenomena which are objects of physical sight. And they are no more logically demonstrable to men who are lacking in spiritual vision than colors are logically demonstrable to men who are color-blind. We take only a languid interest in the critical discussion as to the authorship of the four gospels. We find in them a portrait of a character which transcends human limitations, and that is enough. Who painted the portrait is a matter of minor concern. We attend without anxiety to the materialistic investigations into the physical organism of man, and listen with absolute incredulity to the conclusion of the Positivist that there is no freedom of the will. Our answer is Ben Jonson's—"All argument is against the freedom of the will; we know we're free and that's the end on't." We find our faith neither strengthened by philosophical arguments in support of immortality, nor weakened by philosophical argu-

ments against it. We realize in ourselves a nature superior to disease, decay, mortality; we do not think we *shall* be immortal—we know that we *now are* so. We do not accept God because he is logically presented to us as the most convenient hypothesis to account for the creation. A divine spirit looks out from nature and from life into our own souls, as the human spirit from the eyes of the wife and the mother. We are sorry for the Agnostic who does not see with our eyes. But we decline to accept the limitations which are of his own fashioning, or to deny that we know what we know, because he has closed in his own soul the windows which we have left open, and shut out from himself the vision which lies open and patent and visible and certain before us.

LYMAN ABBOTT.

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF THE CIVIL WAR.

III.

BY GENERAL VISCOUNT WOLSELEY, K. P., ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF THE BRITISH ARMY.

In my last article the conduct of the War was chiefly examined from the Northern side. Turning now to the South, the contrast in its management by the Confederate leaders during this part of the War is very conspicuous. Already the general scheme of the War had practically passed under General Robert Lee's direction, though in the earlier period he acted only as adviser to the President, whilst Johnston commanded the army between Richmond and Washington in the Peninsula. There are some who think that war is a game of pure chance, in which great leaders form their plans on some unintelligible inspiration which guides them as to the right course to be pursued, that they draw nothing from the experience of earlier wars, and that none can tell why one man succeeds and another fails. Let those who think thus call to mind the words I have quoted from Stonewall Jackson, drawn absolutely and merely from his knowledge of war, as learned from the great leaders of former days. Then let them observe how, in practice, both Lee on the larger and Jackson on the minor scale applied them, and to how great an extent the triumphs of their armies were due to the skilful application of those principles. Moreover, since, as Burns tells us, the best-laid schemes "o' mice and men gang aft agley," let them note how, when the men failed, the principles asserted their importance.

In the first place, consider the respective forces in the Shenandoah Valley and neighboring departments. Jackson had an available force at first, in the beginning of March, 1862, of about 5,000 men, strengthened at the beginning of May by Ewell's division, which raised his army to perhaps 14,000 men. According to the careful estimate of the editors (note page 285), there were opposed to him in the Valley 44,840 men. In addition, there were in

the neighboring departments, available for the march on Richmond, a number of troops that brought up their forces to 80,000 men. As a great strategic question, the object desired by the employment of Jackson's little army in the Shenandoah Valley was to keep occupied and retain there as large a number of the Federal forces as possible, so that the main Confederate army engaged in the decisive issue against McClellan should have every possible chance. In fact, it was Jackson's rôle to prevent any reënforcements from being sent to McClellan, and, above all things, to create an alarm at Washington for the safety of that capital.

In his first action at Kernstown, when he was acting purely on the defensive, Jackson's object was simply to "mystify" the enemy as to his actual numbers. This he accomplished, time after time, by the choice of strong positions, where, without committing himself to a decisive action, he was still able to deal with considerable portions of the enemy's forces. In these operations, therefore, he qualified his general principle, "to remain quiescent in presence of superior force," by giving battle whenever attacked by fractions of the Union forces. He succeeded in his larger purpose, for the alarm he created at Washington was sufficient to stop any further troops being withdrawn from the Valley, and Banks's corps, then on its march to the Potomac, was stopped and turned back towards Winchester. This action at Kernstown took place on March 23, 1862, and it was on his arrival at Fort Monroe, on April 2, that General McClellan received a telegram withdrawing 10,000 men from his command. It is, therefore, reasonable to conclude that this weakening of the Army of the Potomac was consequent upon Jackson's demonstration towards Winchester with a tiny army, whose vigor caused its strength to be, as usual, so greatly exaggerated. Thus he had already begun "mystifying and misleading" his enemy.

It is, however, his next moves which afford the most brilliant illustrations of his military principles. His sudden disappearance and supposed flight from Port Republic, allowing despair to settle on the minds of all of his friends in the Valley, had the result he intended; that is, their genuine beliefs and anxieties at once reached the enemy. This led to a hasty pursuit, which enabled him to use the very trains he had collected for a supposed start for Richmond, to take him back in time to crush the foremost pursuers at the village of McDowell. So completely, despite the

disparity of numbers between 14,000 and 44,800 men, had he shown how "a small army may destroy a large one in detail" that, as General Schenck, who commanded against him, tells us, "the only question was, how best to extricate ourselves from this disadvantageous position in the presence of a force of the enemy largely superior in numbers."

Then came another mysterious disappearance. Again with superior numbers he struck Fort Royal, surprised it, scattered the force opposed to him, and then "never let up in the pursuit" as long as his men had strength to follow. He then passed round the rear of Banks's intrenchments at Strasbourg and struck him in flank as he retreated, capturing 3,000 men and enormous quantities of stores, and creating the wildest alarm at Washington, which incalculably multiplied the effect of his action. McDowell, then on the march to join McClellan, was ordered back, and told to detach 20,000 men to the Shenandoah Valley. It was impossible for Jackson to maintain himself long in the field with such greatly superior forces opposed to him. These brilliant successes, however, appear to me models of their kind, both in conception and in execution. They should be closely studied by all officers who wish to learn the art and science of war. His action at Cross Keys against Frémont, by which he kept him apart from Shields, contriving first to fight Frémont's 10,500 men with 13,000 in a favorable position, and then to crush Shields with 3,000 men, was an operation which stamped him as a military genius of a very high order. It must be remarked that McClellan was not taken in by these operations. He saw through them, and understood their object: not so, however, those who ruled at Washington.

Brilliant as these operations were, they would have missed their point and climax without the sudden transfer of Jackson's whole force, at the end of them, to join in the attack on the right wing of McClellan's army at Gaines's Mill. These operations in the Shenandoah Valley not only reduced to quiescence and inactivity the greatly superior Federal forces in that region, but made Mr. Lincoln feel anxious lest the Capital should be attacked from that quarter. To cover the heavy blows he struck within the Valley, Jackson had already so often spread false rumors of an immediate transfer of his force to Richmond that now, when really about to move there, the common rumor of his intention was not believed. The manner in which he thus mystified his

enemy regarding this most important movement was a masterpiece. The one thing necessary was to disappear from all knowledge of the enemy immediately after he had delivered his last stunning blows in the Valley. For some time he left his cavalry watching the defeated enemy, whose ignorance of his whereabouts greatly increased the alarm at Washington. The effect of his ably-devised and skilfully-executed moves is fully acknowledged by Colonel Irwin, who admits that they were the cause of McDowell's forward movement to join McClellan being stopped. It will thus be seen that Jackson's 14,000 men had actually paralyzed the 80,000 Federal troops who were available in the theatre of his operations for a march upon Richmond.

Whilst Jackson's operations in the Shenandoah Valley had kept Richmond safe from alarms on that side, they had served to keep Washington in continual alarm. At last the mere terror he inspired became so far a substitute for his presence that he was able to get away to assist Lee in punishing the further error which Stanton's follies had entailed upon McClellan. The extension across the Chickahominy exposed the isolated right flank of the Federal army to the deadly blow which was about to be delivered against it. For that operation, with only the troops before Richmond, Lee had hardly sufficient strength. The transfer thither of Jackson's corps, however, effected the concentration of all the forces of the Confederacy then between Richmond and Washington. Lee was thus enabled to strike McClellan, who was left to his own resources; for the moral effect of Jackson's Valley operations was so great at Washington that McClellan could not expect any reënforcements. It was much easier to conceal from McClellan the direction of Jackson's move than it would have been that of any other force then in his front. In looking at the methods in detail by which this mystification of his enemy was secured, I am specially amused by the story which is told by General Imboden of General Whiting. After General Whiting's first interview with Jackson, and just at the moment when secrecy was absolutely necessary to the success of Jackson's transfer to the Chickahominy, we are told that General Whiting came away "in a towering passion, and declared that Jackson had treated him outrageously," and then, by way of explanation, added: "Oh, hang him! he was polite enough. But he didn't say one word about his plans. I finally asked him for

orders, telling him what troops I had. He simply told me to go back to Staunton, and he would send me orders to-morrow. I haven't the slightest idea what they will be. I believe he hasn't any more sense than my horse."

How often have subordinates left their leader's headquarters under a similarly false impression! To dissemble well is an art useful to the general. Before this paper is finished it will be necessary to suggest that on one occasion General Lee himself suffered pretty severely for omitting a precaution of the kind. There are, of course, times when it is most necessary that subordinate officers should thoroughly understand and should have studied the general scope of the operations in which they are to coöperate. No pains can then be too great to insure that all thoroughly know the part to be played by every division, and how they themselves are to contribute to the result aimed at. As a rule, however, in these cases it is wise to let the plans be known as short a time beforehand as possible, and to take exceptional precautions that no knowledge even of their existence should leak out. In the case of a movement such as Jackson was then contemplating, there could be no need for a man in General Whiting's position to know it. Without knowing it at the time, he allowed his personal vanity to feel hurt because his curiosity had not been satisfied, and from this combined influence arose the unworthy want of confidence in his chief which here found vent in words. The vanity of small-minded subordinates makes them long to be consulted in the plans under consideration, and often to resent, as General Whiting did on this occasion, the reticence of their chief.

Now, these are just the kind of considerations which have to give way in war. What is known and believed in your own army is sure to reach the enemy, and before long to be known and believed in all his camps. Rumor has a thousand tongues, and it is amazing how many ears supply the tongue with information. The difficulty which arises when plans are communicated to nobody whatever must be freely admitted; for if the general be killed, his plans die with him. But this, which has been, in one or two of these papers, raised as an objection to Jackson's method, does not, I think, apply, because all his plans were known to Johnston or to Lee, with whom, whilst in the Shenandoah Valley, he was always in telegraphic communication. Any one who had succeeded to his command would naturally have applied by telegraph to Rich-

mond for further instructions. As a rule, this difficulty is easily met by imparting confidence to the one officer who is usually necessary for the execution of details. That is one reason why it is so important to have a chief of the staff of rank, as the right-hand man of a commanding general. It was evidently Jackson's practice always to communicate his plans to one confidential subordinate. Indeed, so thoroughly does this seem to have been understood by his staff that Colonel Kyd Douglas (page 622) uses the expression, "It was *my turn* this day to be intrusted with the knowledge of his purpose." A general who acts thus must reckon upon being often misunderstood, and upon exciting at least some temporary ill-feeling among those of his subordinates who do not understand his method, who have not as yet learned to trust their chief implicitly, and who have not learned from the study of war to appreciate to the full the importance of secrecy and of the mystification of an enemy. That is one of the reasons why it is so indispensable for a man intrusted with high command to have about him those who do understand and fully trust him. The arrival of a man, no matter how able a soldier he may be, who allows himself to entertain towards his commanding officer the feelings of General Whiting, is a danger to the service of a state proportionate to the importance of his rank and the influence and authority which he exercises.

The brilliancy of Jackson's moves was marred by one flaw at the last. It is clear that he underestimated by nearly twenty-four hours the time when he could get his force into position to deliver its great blow against McClellan's right flank. This mistake on his part involved Lee in a premature attack, which cost the Confederates dear. I incline to attribute this to the fact that Jackson did not know the Peninsula as well as he knew the Shenandoah Valley. Apparently the roads by which he had been previously moving were at least fairly good when compared with the execrable bush roads—and even they were few in number—over which Lee and McClellan were then moving. His marvellously rapid marches could not have been made if they had not been so. The roads in the valley of the Chickahominy were of mud, which Napoleon, when suffering, during his Polish campaigns, from the same difficulty, called the "fifth element." Those marches of McClellan which created so much annoyance in Washington by their slowness—fifty-two miles in sixteen days—show how

the mud was impeding movement on both sides. Relatively, therefore, Jackson's move was, in all probability, exhaustingly rapid; an effort made by his enthusiastic troops to accomplish what proved to be the impossible task for which he had pledged himself to Lee. Obviously the fault here lies in the neglect of the authorities at Richmond to have the ground in the Peninsula thoroughly surveyed and reported on. From all accounts it is clear that in this respect the Northern troops had a great advantage. Pains were taken by McClellan, whose education made him realize the importance of good maps, to have surveys and reports made of the whole country during his occupation of it. The Confederates, as so often happens with troops in their own country,—as was the case, for instance, with the French in 1870,—had omitted this precaution, and they paid dearly for the neglect. If the belief is correct that Jackson's troops had made a most exhausting effort prior to the battle of Gaines's Mill, that would account for the fact which has been so much commented on, and which produced so injurious an effect on the subsequent seven-days' battles, that Jackson did, after Gaines's Mill, "let up in the pursuit." His qualification of his own principle explains it,—"as long as your men have strength to follow." There is a point at which human energy, with the best troops, reaches its limit. Probably that limit had been passed by the end of the battle of Gaines's Mill.

It is desirable here to leave for the moment General Jackson at the end of his Shenandoah campaign and of his attack on McClellan's flank, and turn oack to a period in the Peninsula antecedent to that attack. There is, obviously, some mystery which has not as yet been cleared up, which two men only can clear up, and on which they, for some reason or other, both seem indisposed to enlighten us, as to the first day's battle at Seven Pines. General Smith's account of that fight clearly throws the responsibility for the failure to crush the Federal left wing upon General Longstreet. Yet there were no written orders given to General Longstreet, and General J. E. Johnston himself seems unwilling to speak pointedly as to what his actual orders to Longstreet were. It seems to be writ large on the face of the facts that, if General J. E. Johnston's plans, as explained by General Smith, had been fully carried out during the early morning,—as it seems they easily might have been,—the whole of the Federal forces south of

the Chickahominy on that morning would have been broken up, dispersed, or captured, and in all probability the slowly-arriving detachments from the north bank would, in their turn, have been driven into the river and destroyed. When two soldiers like Johnston and Longstreet decline to discuss the question, we have no business to try to set them by the ears. The deductions from the facts are in no way affected by the question as to which was to blame for allowing McClellan's forces to escape destruction. There can be no doubt, it would seem, that here, as elsewhere, bad maps and insufficient acquaintance with the ground were largely responsible for the confused crossing by the Confederate corps commanders of one another's routes, and for that dislocation of the intended order of battle which made complete success impossible.

That the position in which McClellan's army stood, part on one side and part on the other of a river liable to sudden floods, and apt in those floods to break down all means of communication across it, was a very dangerous one, is obvious at once. It is very evident that, as long as General J. E. Johnston was operating only with the army then present at Richmond, the Federal left wing was the right fraction for him to strike at. As the army defending Richmond could be wholly concentrated to the south of the Chickahominy without exposing the Capital, which lay well to the south, a sudden and secret movement against McClellan's left flank was easy, whilst an attack upon the right flank would have been tedious and difficult. The moment selected for the attack was happily chosen immediately after the river had risen in sudden flood. All that failed was the execution. In war there is in regard to almost every question a Scylla as well as a Charybdis to be avoided. When an elaborate combination of several corps over an intricate country had to be carried out by aid of very imperfect maps, it would have been better to have written orders explaining the whole situation prepared and given personally at the last moment to each of the commanders, the utmost precaution being taken against the loss of any one of the copies. It was a case in which, even if in the course of the day a copy had fallen into the enemy's hands, it would have profited him very little. Nothing could have enabled the Federal forces to the north of the Chickahominy to arrive in time to support the left, or the left to escape over the Chickahominy, if the Confederate corps had taken their proper directions. Nevertheless, here as else-

where, one can only say that men, like mice, will often fail in their best efforts. By the second day the golden hours and opportunity had slipped away. The lost moment never returns in war.

It is interesting to compare this scheme of Johnston's with Lee's plan for attacking the right wing at Gaines's Mill. The situation had changed. This weak right wing of the Federals was now to the north of the Chickahominy River, as when Johnston attacked it had been on the south side, and Jackson's corps was now free to move, because of the paralysis of the troops against whom he had been contending. Moreover, the course of Jackson's operations had brought him relatively near to Richmond, and Stuart's brilliant ride round McClellan had given Lee full information as to the distribution of the Federal forces. The destruction of the Federal right would cut off McClellan's whole force from his original base. It is clear that at a very early date Lee anticipated the possibility of McClellan's transferring his communications to the James River, and may have calculated on that move before he ordered the attack on the Federal right wing. Such a change of base by McClellan would not affect the fact that the defeat of that wing would deprive the Federal army of vast supplies, and would provide the Confederates with stores of which they stood sorely in need. In addition to all these reasons, the attack on the Federal right could, by the arrival of Jackson's force, be developed with better chance of its being a surprise than any attack on the Federal left could have been. It is, therefore, clear that Lee's selection for his point of attack was as sound at Gaines's Mill as Johnston's attack on the left was at Seven Pines. The fact—a fact fully reckoned upon by Lee—that McClellan was counting upon the Federal forces west of the Blue Ridge to retain Jackson in the north, and that he was continually appealing on this subject to the authorities at Washington, helped to make the movement more deadly. Lee contrived very cleverly to make it be thought in the Federal army and at Washington that he was sending reënforcements to the Shenandoah Valley, when Jackson was in reality on his way to Mechanicsville.

The one just defence which McClellan is able to offer for the dangerous division of his army astride the Chickahominy is that, according to his statement,—and it is undisputed,—that distribution of his troops was expressly ordered

from Washington, the object being that he might keep in communication with the force under McDowell, which, however, never came to his assistance. As quoted by Colonel Irwin (page 437), McClellan said: "Our men [at Gaines's Mill] did all that men could do, . . . but they were overwhelmed by vastly superior numbers, even after I brought my last reserves into action. . . . I have lost this battle because my force is too small." Clearly this assertion is not borne out by the facts. The last reserves of the whole army were never brought into action because they were then south of the Chickahominy River. The battle was lost because, owing to the separation of the right wing of the Federal army from its left by that river, it was possible to throw the mass of the Confederate army in a deadly direction upon a fraction of the army opposed to it. This answer is evident; it is complete. Without doubt the authorities at Washington were responsible for the fact that their army was too small to occupy the position which they had ordered it to assume. But, according to my views as to the powers and responsibilities of a general commanding in the field, McClellan can never be excused, under the shelter of Government orders, for placing his army in the false, and therefore the dangerous, position it was in when attacked on the Chickahominy. It was the gravest of errors, for which he had to pay in reputation, and his army in blood. Only by reënforcing his army to such an extent that the position on each bank of the river should be equal to the whole Confederate army, Jackson included, could his position astride the Chickahominy have been excusable, and even then the situation would not have been free from danger.

Most people will agree with the Comte de Paris that McClellan had a tendency greatly to exaggerate the numbers of the forces immediately opposed to him—a failing which led him frequently into a hesitating mode of action, which was of great advantage to his opponents. Just as at whist, if you know the play and temperament of your opponents, you may often score points which the mere routine play of the game would not give you, so it would seem that Lee and Jackson, who personally knew McClellan, each counted on this quality of his mind. Oddly enough, just as at whist, play of this kind may sometimes be punished, if the player against you is for once, for any reason, above his mark: so in the subsequent campaign Lee and Jackson

found that they had reckoned without their host. But of this it will be convenient to speak more fully presently.

The retreat to the James was an extremely ably-conducted operation, carried out under great difficulties and, above all, in the presence of such opponents as Lee and Jackson. It ought not to have succeeded as it did: had the defeated army been pressed as it should have been, it must have been destroyed. For some reason or other, however, Jackson and his army did not show their usual quality in that pursuit; this seems to be generally admitted by those who fought in the campaign. Whether the reason suggested for this be the true one or not can never now be fully known. It is not possible now to deal fairly with the reputation of a great soldier who has left no records to explain his action or his difficulties. With the greatest respect for General Longstreet as a soldier, it must be admitted that there is at times a tone in his writing about both Lee and Jackson which grates on the ear. Any general who has commanded such numbers in the field as he has done, must know how often criticism is unjust to leaders, whose surrounding circumstances, whose motives and intentions we can never now have fully laid before us. Surely we ought to judge them by what they accomplished in those instances where we do fully know and understand all that took place. The excuse made for Jackson in one of these papers, that he was only at his best when he was acting entirely on his own responsibility, is neither satisfactory nor just to him. Not only did Lee always look upon him as his most effective agent, but the saying of Jackson about Lee, elswhere recorded—"That man is a phenomenon; I would follow him blindfold anywhere"—shows how perfect may be the subordination of one really able general to another, when it happens to be his duty for the time to play second fiddle. It is said to be just possible that at the epoch of the War marked by the seven-days' campaign Jackson had not yet learned to appreciate Lee's genius as fully as he did later; few will, however, attach much importance to this notion.

Next comes one of those periods when Jackson, under circumstances most trying to an energetic man, strictly adhered to his own principles. Despatched to the north to meet the forces which were gathering under Pope, he had, in consequence of the insufficiency of his force, to remain inactive from July 12 to August 9, 1862. These are just the times when every newspaper in a demo-

cratically-governed country begins to cry out against the sloth and inactivity of a general. Nor will any previous reputation for zeal and activity save him from such charges. They were constantly and freely preferred against the Duke of Wellington in the Peninsula during some of his most wise and necessary pauses in that long contest, and after some of his most brilliant victories had shown the world of what stuff he was made, and had shown England how entirely she could trust him. Jackson, however, was strictly adhering to his own principle, "Never fight against heavy odds, if by any possible manœuvring you can hurl your own force on only a part, and that the weakest part, of your enemy, and crush it." For the latter purpose it is often necessary to bide one's time, and to have patience in biding it, which is not always easy. In this instance the time was entirely independent of anything that Jackson could do. As Lee puts it, "The uncertainty that then surrounded the designs of McClellan rendered it inexpedient to reënforce him [Jackson] from the army of Richmond." Those are facts, however, which are seldom taken into full account in the ranks of an army, and very rarely indeed by sensational newspaper writers, who, during a war, discourse so learnedly on all that goes on. Had this time of waiting been longer than, fortunately for Jackson, it actually was, his "inactivity" would doubtless have been the subject of many a savage leading article. In these days of telegraphic daily reports, even three uneventful weeks—the time during which he actually remained quiescent—may suffice to damn the fairest military reputation.

However, on July 27, 1862, A. P. Hill's division was ordered to join Jackson. As soon as Hill joined him, mark with what rapidity he acted! On August 9 he caught Banks at Cedar Mountain, and once more showed how a small army may be superior at the point of contact to the fractions of a larger. His superiority was not great,—20,000 to 17,900, according to the best estimates,—but it was sufficient. His own reputation, the confidence of his troops, and their war-tried experience under him, were elements which added indefinitely to his fighting strength. The wide-sweeping move round Pope, which followed, depended for its success, first, on Jackson's faculty for carrying out a secret manœuvre, secondly, on the trained marching rapidity of his troops, and, lastly, on the fact, which had become apparent to the Confederate generals, that the Washington authorities had so tied Pope to a post that

it was safe to march round him because he could not move. It is rather remarkable that, in General Pope's description of the campaign, he appears to treat the loss of the stores at Manassas Junction as a trifling matter. In the long run, no doubt, that loss may not have been very important to the well-supplied Northern armies; but there can be no question that both by its material and moral effects it enormously increased the demoralization of the Union army after the second defeat of Bull Run. Before that battle it exercised a most disastrous influence by shaking the confidence of men and officers in their commander, however much justification he may have for throwing the responsibility for it upon other shoulders. In a campaign men do not nicely argue out questions of abstract justice; it is the broad effects which tell on the spirit of an army. There can be no doubt that, in fighting the second Bull Run, the successful raid was worth several thousand men to the Confederates, from the encouragement it afforded them and the depression it produced among their opponents. When I was with General Lee's army at Winchester, in the autumn of 1862, the soldiers in every camp laughingly spoke of Pope as "Stonewall Jackson's Commissary," so entirely had Jackson in the "Pope Campaign" depended upon capturing from that General everything he required for his men.

To put in practice Jackson's principle of bringing a small army to bear upon the fractions of a large one, it is often necessary to employ a portion of that little army, in a strong position, for the purpose of delaying the movements of the remainder of the enemy's forces. Jackson practised this when he employed some of his troops in the passes of the mountains to hold Frémont in check, whilst with all the troops he could collect he moved to attack Banks. It is clear that this was also Lee's object at the battle of South Mountain. He sought to check the advance of the Federal Army whilst Jackson overwhelmed the garrison of Harper's Ferry. As far as I can follow the circumstances, it seems to me that, if Jackson was to secure the desired result, Lee was right in what he did. I cannot see how, if Lee had at once fallen back in the way suggested by General Longstreet, Franklin could have been prevented from relieving Harper's Ferry. On the other hand, from the evidence before me in these papers, it would appear that several things happened which neither Lee nor Jackson had anticipated. It is interesting to note what these events

were and how they came about. General Walker quotes Jackson as saying, when he knew of McClellan's advance: "I thought I knew McClellan, but this movement of his puzzles me." Though a good deal of Walker's evidence has been disputed, I do not think that anything brought forward tends to shake this statement, which is very precise, and not one about which memory would be likely to mislead. This commentary of Jackson upon McClellan, before devising the plan of campaign at Frederick, and the remark made by Lee (also quoted)—namely, "Are you acquainted with General McClellan?"—prove that both Lee and Jackson planned their course of action upon what they believed to be a just estimate of McClellan's character and of his genius for caution. The demoralization of Pope's army was well known to the Confederate generals. It seems clear to me that Lee counted upon it, and upon McClellan's slowness, to enable him to take Harper's Ferry and, perhaps, to move beyond it before McClellan had reorganized his army. In this calculation Lee was mistaken.

All the descriptions we have of the reception of McClellan by his old army as he rode out to meet it returning beaten, disorganized, and demoralized from the second battle of Bull Run, agree in this —that the fact of his presence with it restored confidence to all ranks. I would ask those who have not been in the habit of considering the conditions which determine the power or weakness of an army in war to read these accounts of McClellan's reception by his army. Let them observe the reports made by all upon the state of the army as it retreated, or rather fled, to Washington; mark the impression produced on Mr. Lincoln and Stanton as to the utter powerlessness of the Union Army to stop the Confederates and to save Washington. Let them note the conviction in the minds of Lee and Jackson that this army was so shaken that it could not be in a state to fight for at least three weeks or more; and then let them turn to that summary, made in the last article, of the blunders, the ignorant self-confidence, and the folly of Mr. Stanton at the time when he appointed Pope to the command of the Army of Virginia. All those mistakes were now coming home to roost, with consequences fatal to the power of the army. The troops had no confidence in their leader, no confidence in themselves. Here, visibly, under the eyes of the man who had caused all this disaster, though probably even then he did not realize his own absolute and complete responsibility as to the cer-

tain cause of it, the army was not going, but had gone, to pieces. He had imagined he could drive the horses of the Sun, and horses and he were being dashed to pieces. He had attempted a task for which he was absolutely incompetent. He seems to have imagined that mere self-assertion would carry him through ; that the conduct of a campaign was the easiest and simplest thing imaginable, and that, if only he gave orders, the rest must go like clock-work. Suddenly the man who can drive the horses seizes the reins that have dropped from the other's incompetent hands. In a moment all is changed. Those who will be at the trouble to study the evidence for this story will see that it is no exaggeration.

Now, what must have been, what was, according to his own account, the effect of all this upon McClellan himself ? The precise mistake which gentlemen like Mr. Stanton make lies in supposing that soldiers and armies are machines, instead of men living under certain special conditions—men whose ways and feelings and prejudices you must understand before you can command and lead them with advantage. But generals are as little machines as armies are. The Napoleon of 1796 and the Napoleon of Waterloo were two different men. So the cautious, rather cold-blooded, and indecisive, timid soldier whom Lee and Jackson had known at West Point, and had fought with in the Peninsula, was not the McClellan who felt himself to be the one man who had restored confidence to a beaten army. All at once he heard nothing around him but enthusiastic demands to be led forward to victory from the very men who, till he joined them, were only seeking safety in individual flight. No man could go through such an experience and not be affected by it. All the circumstances that had preceded this event tended to deepen its effect upon his mind. Failure in the Peninsula, for which he felt he was not to blame ; snubbing from Halleck, who, whenever he appears on the scene, shows himself as the very incarnation of what Shakespeare meant by "the insolence of office"; the sound of the guns of his distant army, which he was not allowed to join, while he felt it was being led to certain defeat through the incompetency of its commander; his reception at Washington, where his warnings as to the condition of the Union Army were despised ; then the ample fulfilment of his worst fears, and the sight of the abject panic of those who, until that moment, were full of overweening confidence ; add to

all this the attempt made even at the last moment to hamper him,—and it is not to be wondered at that, when he rode out to meet his army, he seems to have regarded the proceeding almost in the light of a revolutionary act which his duty to the Nation had rendered necessary.

All these things must have sent the blood coursing through his veins, bracing him for the supreme moment of triumph over his enemies in Washington which his enthusiastic reception by his old soldiers at length afforded him. Under such conditions, a man's nature for the time may well be changed. How could McClellan help feeling a renewed confidence in himself, when he and all the army, and all those whom he believed to be his personal enemies, were thus convinced of his power by the efficiency restored to the army the moment he appeared again as its leader? Under ordinary circumstances, his methodical disposition might—perhaps it may be said certainly would—have led him to spend those weeks in reorganization upon which Lee had counted. But in the position in which he then found himself, it must have seemed to him that, as the disorganization of the army was directly attributable to his absence from it, so his presence with it—hailed as it was by all ranks—was, of itself, sufficient to restore it to order and efficiency. He may well have thought, under these circumstances, that no weeks of repose were necessary to prepare it for battle, and may well have looked only for some good opportunity to test its fighting value, now that it had been again placed under his command. It must, indeed, have been a proud event of his life, for he felt that he alone of all men was able to restore heart and life to that beaten army as it streamed back towards Washington.

All he now wanted was that Lee should afford him the opportunity to show what that army, under the spell of his name, could accomplish. This General Lee was preparing to offer him, and a lucky accident suddenly placed in his hands the full detail of Lee's intended plan of operations. The paper containing it had been picked up by chance. From it he learns that Lee, trusting to the disorganization which he believed reigned in the Federal army, had ordered Jackson to take Harper's Ferry, whilst the main Confederate army had been broken up into several disunited fragments. The evidence is supplied in McClellan's own letter to the editors of the *Century*, as to the importance which

he attached to this information (page 603). Within little more than an hour after McClellan had read that paper, orders for the advance of the Federal Army on South Mountain were given.

But such moments of exaltation as that then experienced by McClellan are apt to bring their reaction after them. In this instance the character of the man reasserts itself when he arrives before the slender Confederate screen then in occupation of South Mountain. As usual, he allows himself to estimate the forces opposed to him as vastly greater than they really are, and to act as if they were so. Still, the vast numerical superiority of the Northern army could not but assert itself over the Confederates, reduced, by the straggling of the numbers of bare-footed men in their ranks, to little more than 40,000 within the fighting area.

Lee had driven back the Army of the Potomac and that of Virginia to the point from which they had started in the spring and summer. He knew how demoralized those armies had become from repeated defeats, and he was fully aware of the scare which Pope's disasters had occasioned at Washington. Mr. Lincoln was known to be very nervous for the safety of that capital. Lee felt that if he could but still further increase this fear of losing Washington, he might so retain the Federal armies in its neighborhood as to free the northern districts of Virginia from all hostile occupation during the autumn. His object was to keep McClellan's forces far away from Richmond until winter had so destroyed the roads as to render all field operations near that city practically impossible.

Although a vast amount of valuable equipment and military stores had been taken by the "Army of Northern Virginia" from Pope, it was still a very badly-supplied army, and sadly in want of transport. Notwithstanding this fact, Lee thought his best plan to accomplish the end he had in view was to invade Maryland, where the Southern cause had thousands of sympathizers, and by that operation keep the war at a distance from Richmond. Lee had, however, it seems to me, underestimated the revivifying influence which McClellan exerted over the Federal armies when again placed in actual command of them; nor did Maryland afford him the assistance he had expected. He also miscalculated the time required for the capture of Harper's Ferry—a miscalculation which placed him in a position of real danger. An enterprising commander, not impressed as McClellan always was

with the notion that his enemy was vastly stronger than he actually was, would then have pushed Lee very hard indeed. McClellan, with Lee's plan of campaign in his pocket and the large force at his disposal, was in the position where a really great general would have destroyed an adversary who had crossed the Potomac and distributed his troops as Lee's were on the 13th, 14th, 15th, and 16th September, 1862.

The battles of South Mountain and Antietam proved to Lee that his army was not strong enough to carry out an aggressive campaign against the now united armies of the North. From the moment that McClellan had restored confidence to the Northern army, and, thanks to the captured despatch, had made up his mind to act, it was obviously Lee's policy to avoid fighting as much as possible and recross into Virginia. Antietam, though a battle unwittingly fought by him, was, however, unavoidable. It is necessary to estimate a general's purposes in judging what he has gained or lost by a battle. That the actual result on the battlefield was a Confederate victory seems to be little disputed. Lee had gained what he had hoped to secure by that battle, which was to make good his repassage of the Potomac. The Confederate army had won a battle, but had achieved no victory, whilst the Confederacy had failed in its intention to carry the war into the enemy's country. Colonel Kyd Douglas states the case very fairly when he says: "The prestige of the day was with Lee, but when, on the night of the 18th, he recrossed into Virginia, he left the prestige of the result with McClellan." (Page 629).

Lee's management of the battle against vastly superior forces was wonderfully successful. His retreat afterwards was as wise and necessary as it was admirably conducted. It is only for schoolboys that retreat under such circumstances can be said to take anything from the prestige of men like Lee. He was soon to show, against generals who, as McClellan put it, "acted before they were ready," how brilliantly he could deal with the opportunities victory gave him, as well as with circumstances which, as in this instance, made it necessary to prepare the way for retreat.

I must reserve for the next article all notice of the few papers on the events in the West which appear in this second volume. They are too closely connected with those which follow in the third volume to be dealt with separately.

WOLSELEY.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

THE GERMAN ARMY,

WITH PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS—1848 TO 1889.

BY KARL BLIND.

I.

THESE summer months form an ever-memorable anniversary in the tragic history of the German movement for freedom and union. Full forty years have now elapsed since a prolonged and most sanguinary struggle took place; regular army fighting against regular army in those days of turmoil. It was the struggle between the men who still stood true to the popular cause as represented by the rump of the National Parliament and by Democratic risings on the one hand, and the Royalist forces on the other, under the command of the Crown Prince of Prussia, the later Emperor-King William I.

Under the national and democratic banner were ranged the troops of the expelled Baden dynasty, who had gone over to the side of the Revolution, together with a number of militia and volunteer regiments. On the side of political reaction—counting the Prussian forces as well as those of the Executive at Frankfort—there was an overwhelming Royalist army, more than three times larger, composed of nearly 80,000 men. Yet it took several months, and a series of battles in the open field, before the popular cause was vanquished. The sequel of the princely victory was a court-martialling of prisoners of war, extending over several months, and a reign of terror which drove more men into exile than ever fled from Poland or France after an unsuccessful rising or a but too successful state-stroke.

I will not recount here the details of the upheaval of 1848–'49, which shook the thrones of the Fatherland. Only, to give an idea of the original depth and strength of the revolutionary current, it may be brought to recollection that one of the first acts of the National Assembly at Frankfort was to declare the "Sovereignty of the Nation," and that this was done under the initiative of its Speaker, Baron Heinrich von Gagern, otherwise a moderate Constitutionalist, a man of an old, aristocratic family. The whole of Germany, including our then federal provinces of

Austria, was represented in that Assembly. The deputies of Schleswig-Holstein also had answered to the trumpet-call of the nation. In the previous Provisional Parliament, in April, 1848, Dr. Welcker, the aged champion of constitutional monarchy, had proposed a bill, in the name of the so-called Committee of Seven, of which Gagern was a member, which was not less significant. According to it, all Germany was to have :

(1) A Chief of the Confederacy, with responsible ministers.

(2) A Senate, composed of representatives of the various States of the Confederacy.

(3) A People's House, formed by direct elections.

There was to be one army for all Germany ; one diplomatic representation abroad ; one system of commerce, of navigation laws, of entrance duties, of coinage, measure, and weight, of postal and water conveyance and railways ; also unity in civil and criminal law and in judicial procedure; a Federal High Court of Justice and a National Bill of Rights. The remarkable thing in this proposition was the entire omission of the word "Monarchy." It was omitted from no lack of monarchical sentiments, but because, in the excited state of public opinion, it was thought prudent to refrain for a while from mentioning Princes. Ultra-reactionists therefore said the bill of these Moderates might as well have been applied to the establishment of a kingless Commonwealth.

On their part, the Republicans, officered by Friedrich Hecker and Gustav von Struve,—both of whom in later years fought as exiles in America on the side of the Union,—proposed at Frankfort the establishment of "United States of Germany." Their bill began with the abolition of standing armies and the creation of a national militia. The introduction of a progressive income-tax; the formation of a Ministry of Labor; the promotion of the coöperative principle, and similar measures were to benefit the working classes. The last paragraph ran thus: "Abolition of the hereditary-monarchical form of government, and substitution for it of freely-elected legislatures, at whose head freely-elected Presidents are placed—all united in a Federal Constitution, on the example of the North American States."

II.

"One army" was the cry of the monarchical Constitutionalists, but they did not define the nature of its composition. A

national militia, on the Swiss model, was the demand of the Republicans. The Swiss system entails compulsory service upon all able-bodied men. In Germany universal liability for such service had until then—and the same remained the case for years afterwards—only existed in Prussia, where it had been decreed in 1814, after the first overthrow of Napoleon.

In the remainder of the German States, the Conscription was in existence. This institution is in England often confounded with the universal service (*allgemeine Wehrpflicht*) of all able-bodied men. Even English officers sometimes speak rather loosely in this sense. In truth, the two systems are very different. Under the one, the peer and the peasant, the burgher, the workman, and the scholar are all drafted into the army. Under the Conscription, lots had to be drawn as to who was to serve in a comparatively small, but numerically fixed, army establishment. Any one who had drawn an "unlucky number" could, if he had the pecuniary means, furnish a substitute willing to become a soldier in his place. So it was also in France up to a recent time.

Overbearing conduct of officers—mostly of aristocratic descent in the higher ranks—and harsh treatment of privates were, in the days preceding the German Revolution, but too often the characteristics of army life. In a time of long peace—unbroken from 1815 to '48—absurd pipe-clay and martinet customs had sprung up. For the mass of the privates there was thus often cause for complaint; but the inexperience of youth and the terrors of the military code rendered it almost impossible for any voice of remonstrance to make itself heard. In this respect, the Revolution brought with it a decided and lasting improvement.

There is another point which must not be forgotten. It is the pride which men are apt to feel when once dressed in the warrior's garb—the contempt they are easily led into against others who are not. This pride in a particular kind of dress often degenerates even—especially among troops got together by conscription or enlistment—into hostile jealousy and bloody conflict between men of the several branches of the army; aye, between differently-clad regiments belonging to the same division of arms.

Of all this I had curious personal experience before 1848. Some of us had for some years before felt strangely hopeful forebodings of coming great events. It was as if a ray of the rising New Era had touched the brow of the younger generation. As

students at the University, we had worked with pen and speech, in public or in confidential conclave, establishing small but active political circles among artisans, citizens, younger men of the merchant class, and members of the Gymnastic Associations, in which the ideas of national freedom and union began strongly to pulsate. It struck me then that, in view of possible future conflicts, the most urgent necessity was to gain a footing within the army itself. It was with considerable difficulty that this was effected at Karlsruhe and in neighboring garrisons ; the worst difficulty being at first to make artillery consort with infantry or dragoons, or the latter between themselves. By degrees, though very slowly, we succeeded, nevertheless. Equally difficult it was, in the beginning, to make men of different classes and callings meet soldiers in some out-of-the-way place in the country where the police would not be engaged in spying. Still, when the Revolution came, the spirit which had thus been working for a time in secret soon manifested itself with quickly increasing strength.

III.

It is a significant fact that throughout Germany, in the early part of the national rising, the army was either compelled, after a sanguinary struggle, to withdraw, or was not available at all for upholding a system hated by the mass of the people. When Frederick William IV., in March, 1848, was virtually defeated in the streets of his capital, and the then Crown Prince driven to seek safety in England, the anger of the Court circles and of the aristocratic officers became indescribable at what they regarded as a dishonor for the army—namely, the King's order to the troops to leave Berlin. However, in the war against Denmark the Prussian army soon obtained an opportunity of gaining better laurels than it possibly could by the destruction of the nation's hopes for freedom and union. Only the King, later on, secretly counteracted the deliverance of Schleswig-Holstein, which had been achieved by military victories, and so those German populations were still kept under foreign dominion until 1863.

Meanwhile, the Army question had come up at Frankfort in the Provisional Parliament of April, 1848. Jakob Venedey, but recently returned from exile, yet holding very moderate views, made the only practical proposal which could have saved the national, cause. His counsel was, unfortunately, not heeded. He was in

the habit of taking his cue from English parliamentary history, from the days of John Hampden; and he very reasonably suggested that, first and foremost, the German National Assembly should form a parliamentary army. His brother-Constitutionalists, being of the academic and professional persuasion, did not see their way to such an effective measure. So the princely armies remained as they were, and though afterwards, when Archduke John of Austria had been elected by the Assembly as Regent of the Empire, all German troops were nominally placed under the command of the executive which had issued from Parliament, the arrangement soon proved a broken reed.

This was first shown in the war against Denmark. The German troops had penetrated as far Jutland when, all at once, the order came from Berlin for a retreat. Frederick William IV. regarded the Schleswig-Holsteiners as "Republican rebels"! Under Russian and English influence, the armistice of Malmö was signed—an act branded by the German masses as downright treachery, and looked upon with disgust by the troops themselves. Yet, by a narrow majority, the National Assembly, from fear of a rupture with the Prussian Government, was brought to accede to this hateful armistice. Had there been a parliamentary army, things would have gone differently indeed. In the absence of such power, the fatal step was made; and immediately afterward barricades were raised at Frankfort and the streets ran with blood. In the turmoil of the strife, atrocities were committed on both sides at which Humanity veiled its face.

These events of September, 1848, had a tremendous echo all over Germany. A rising immediately followed in the Black Forest, under the banner of the German Commonwealth. So uncertain was the Baden Government of the spirit of its own soldiers that troops from Würtemberg, the two Hesses, and Prussia were drafted into the country. Again, as in April, 1848, our Republican rising was defeated; but the defeat bore in it the germ of a coming victory; for, eight months later, nearly the whole Baden army itself rose in defence of the threatened National Assembly, tearing the grand-ducal symbols from its helmets and gathering round the Democratic standard.

IV.

The misfortune during the German Revolution was that Frankfort, Berlin, and Vienna had each a parliamentary centre of

its own: a National Assembly at Frankfort, a Constituent Assembly in the Prussian, a Reichstag in the Austrian, capital. The revolutionary forces were thus scattered, driven in contrary, often clashing, directions. A single Assembly and a single parliamentary army would have given safety, whether the issue had been a United Empire or a Commonwealth.

As it was, Vienna, after nearly a month's siege, was taken by the Imperialist army of Windischgrätz and Jellachich. A system of terror followed, under which Robert Blum and other friends of freedom were martyrized. The overthrow of Vienna emboldened the Court camarilla at Berlin to a state-stroke. Prussian troops, chafing under the remembrance of their retreat from Berlin in March, 1848, and nettled because their victories against Denmark had been rendered fruitless, allowed themselves to be made into tools of oppression. Reasonably speaking, they ought to have done the contrary. But soldiers, when feeling that their glory has been tarnished, are apt to act in a very inconsequential way.

Berlin being got under, the rising at Dresden, in May, 1849, when a provisional government was installed and the dynasty had to fly to the fortress of Königstein, was also suppressed by Prussian troops. Yet such had been the impetus of the popular spirit that men like Richard Wagner and Gottfried Semper, Germany's foremost architect, joined this revolution in Saxony, where formerly they had held Court and Government appointments. Then Rhenish Bavaria rose, and simultaneously, in the Grand-Duchy of Baden a complete military revolution was effected—the first and only instance of this kind in Europe, outside of Spain.

Enormous was the effect of this event. It would lead too far to describe the causes which led to the downfall of the promising movement, to unroll the picture of the battles fought in June and July, 1849, or of the court-martial fusillades which followed, lasting until the end of October. In the midst of the strife, the German Parliament, which had transported its seat to Stuttgart, was dispersed by force of arms. The reactionary victory was finished up by wholesale arrests to such an extent that all prisons and all disposable strong-rooms of the Grand-Duchy did not suffice to hold the captives, whilst the mass of refugees was so enormous that, twelve years afterwards, this part of Germany had not re-attained a population as large as it had possessed before 1849!

During these harrowing events it often came out that the

hearts of the Prussian *Landwehr*—that is, of the older men who had experience of civil and political life—were far more open to sympathy with popular rights than the younger soldiers, particularly those from the more backward country districts. When quartered in the houses of burghers and peasants, *Landwehr* men not rarely gave proof of Liberal inclination. But when cannon roared and the sharpshooters lay in ambush, when the cavalry charge roused the blood of the combatants, such kindly feelings were of no avail. Then brethren in mind and aspirations had to kill each other, and the freedom of the Fatherland received deadly wounds.

V.

In the dreary years of oppression which followed this national tragedy, the spirit of the army, more especially of the Prussian officers, did certainly not improve. Too often the citizens had to complain of overbearing conduct, of high-handed lawlessness, leading to scenes of bloodshed in the streets and in public localities. Within the ranks of the army itself dissatisfaction was frequently rife, in consequence of harsh treatment. Still, a counter-agent always existed there in the fact of men of all classes—the wealthiest and most highly-educated, together with the poorest—serving in the same regiment. Where officers and non-commissioned officers have to deal with such a body of men, they generally feel bound to use a certain caution, lest any misconduct of theirs should be brought home to them, owing to the social connection of a number of soldiers.

The body of officers in Prussia was in those days even more largely composed of members of the old and new nobility than it is now. From the detailed official list of the present year, it appears that among the generals of the infantry and the cavalry there is still not a single man with a commoner's name. Among the lieutenant-generals there are only seven (that is, 8 per cent.) who bear no aristocratic title. Among the major-generals there are but thirty-three commoners; that is, 25 per cent. Among the colonels, there are ninety-nine such; that is, 37 per cent. The aristocratic or nobilized element thus prevails most exceedingly. But if we only go back to the three previous years, we find things even worse. In 1888 there were but 5 per cent. of commoners among the lieutenant-generals. In 1886 only 15 per cent. were

non-aristocratic among the major-generals. In the same year the proportion of commoners among the colonels was but 28 per cent.

Among regiments of the Guard (Grenadiers, Riflemen, etc.), there are now a number without any officer of simple civic name. The same is the case with the great majority of the cavalry regiments of the Guard. Of late there has also been a renewed slight increase of aristocratic officers among lieutenant-colonels, majors, and officers of the staff. Still, upon the whole, there is a decided improvement in comparison with the former state of affairs.

The second war for the deliverance of Schleswig-Holstein fortunately brought out the nobler qualities of the German army. Prussians and Austrians fought, in 1863–'64, side by side, not heeding the danger of possible Russian, English, and French interference, and the victory was quickly assured. The heart of the mass of the nation was in the war. In fact, the Governments of Berlin and Vienna, who at first hung back, were forced into it by the general enthusiasm which threatened the reluctant Courts with a revolutionary rising. Of this serious condition of affairs I can speak with confidence, having at the time been in close connection with a number of prominent leaders and active German patriots both in Schleswig-Holstein and in Germany at large—at Berlin, Frankfort, Vienna, and elsewhere.

Then followed the "fratricidal war" of 1866. Its attained object was to establish Prussian leadership over a section of the German Confederacy; Austria being altogether ejected, whilst the smaller states of the South were left in an intermediate position. As a fratricidal war (*Bruderkrieg*) Prince Bismarck himself has repeatedly described it, in recent years, in the Reichstag. The extreme riskiness of the venture has also been acknowledged by him in most graphic terms, referring to his own personal safety in case of failure. On both sides German armies in 1866 displayed the greatest bravery—Austrians, Saxons, Bavarians, Würtembergers, Badeners, Hessians, Hanoverians, on the one hand; Prussians on the other. But Austria, having at the same time to fight in front, as well as in the rear against the Italians, whilst her regiments from still dissatisfied Hungary were but half reliable, could not make headway against the needle-guns of the solid and superior military organization of Prussia and the tactical genius of Moltke. So the allies of Austria from the smaller states were beaten in detail.

Within a fortnight Prussia had mobilized 500,000 men. Far more behind in putting their forces in the field were Austria and other members of the German Confederacy. Years before, the Prussian Government, in open conflict with its own House of Commons, had insisted on a reorganization of the army, which the representatives of the people had cause to think would be made use of for crippling Constitutional liberties. The Prussian mobilization effected in 1859—when Napoleon III. made war on the Mincio with an eye to a future war on the Rhine—had impressed specialists of every political color with the necessity of army reform. At the same time there was much apprehension lest a King who so openly proclaimed his ideas of "right divine," and who had so fiercely fought against national freedom in 1848–'49, should wish to prepare for himself an instrument of absolutistic rule. Hence that Constitutional conflict in which the majority of the Prussian House of Deputies, pointing to "Strafford and Charles I.," rejected one Government proposal after the other.

It is a matter of notoriety how the Crown and its Minister took no heed of this parliamentary resistance. The proposed change from a two-years' to a three-years' service was forced through. Government effected its army reorganization in a lawless manner, levying taxes without the grant of a Budget. When the day for the assault upon the Confederacy came, the army reorganization thus forcibly wrought certainly stood the Crown in good stead. Still, here again the characteristic spectacle occurred of not a few regiments of the *Landwehr* showing a mutinous spirit. In many cases they at first refused to don their uniforms for what they regarded as a war among brethren. They had to be forced into compliance by regular troops of the line; the latter having in some instances to be called out to make the *Landwehr* enter the railway carriages which were to bring them to the seat of war. True, when they arrived there, they, too, fought splendidly, though with sore hearts.

It was fortunate that the war of 1866 was so quickly ended, or else France might have suddenly dashed in, and Germany once more have become the arena for contending foreign armies—as has been so often the case since the Thirty-Years' War, whenever Germans stood against Germans. It was so in that terrible strife of 1612–'48, which brought about a break, not quite healed even now, in the history and the culture of the Fatherland. Again,

foreign armies, French and Russian, rushed in in the Seven-Years' War, when Frederick II. of Prussia laid the foundations of Prussian leadership in the North against the political connection of the German Empire under Kaisers of Habsburg origin. At the time of Napoleon I., when Prussia and Austria fell out among themselves, foreign dominion and extinction of national unity became complete until the great national revival in 1813.

In the war of 1866, the Prussian Government, before commencing operations, had actually to give a sort of pledge to France, by denuding the Rhine provinces of their proper fortress defence in the way of guns. In the midst of Prussian victories, Napoleon III. insisted on the notorious Paragraph V. being inserted in the Peace treaty of Prag, according to which the northern portion of Schleswig might be handed back to Denmark under certain conditions. This clause was received with much anger by the German nation—so much so that the Austrian Government, when again entering into relations of friendship with Prussia, released the latter from that particular treaty obligation.

It is sad to think that in France even men of the Republican party thought the time had come, in and after 1866, to exact from the Prussian King a territorial indemnification on account of the aggrandizement of his dominions. The German nation was to lose her western frontier, because it had engaged in an internal contest ! The greatest living poet of France, he who had so long opposed "Napoleon the Little," Victor Hugo—whose ancestors were patriotic German Lorrainers—upheld this strange indemnification theory. More than once I had, in those years, an unhappy experience of aggressive military spirit among French Republican friends in exile ; the exceptions to it being but too few.

No better proof can be given of the remarkable hopes formed by Frenchmen in consequence of the German fratricidal war of 1866 than a despatch written immediately afterwards by Napoleon's Minister for Foreign Affairs, M. de Lavalette. In it he declared that whenever France—at the time the German Bund was still in existence—should have a difficulty with Holland (on account of Luxemburg), or with Prussia on the Mosel, or with German states on the Rhine, or with Austria in the Tirol, the united armed forces of the Confederacy would come into the field. But since Austria had been ejected, and Germany at large divided into three parts, this danger, Lavalette said, had

disappeared. The condition of affairs brought about by the war of 1866 he described as *les trois tronçons.* He imagined Germany would henceforth be nothing but "three mutilated stumps," with each of which France could deal separately, in order to annex Luxemburg, the Rhinelands, and even to get an entrance into Germany through the Tirolese mountain gorge.

VI.

These high-flown hopes were doomed to disappointment. Deep was certainly the estrangement between the North and South of Germany immediately after 1866. Napoleon fancied that, if some day he were to attack Prussia, he might make a rapid push into the smaller Southern states, gain them over to his banners, entice the Austrian army at the same time to advance against Prussia—aye, even reckon, in that contingency, upon the coöperation of Italy and Denmark. Agents of his in Germany kept on informing him that the bitterness of the feeling against Prussian aggression in 1866 was such in the South that, if war were to come, he might count on neutrality, even coöperation, there. The only military agent of France who saw things in clearer light was Colonel Stoffel, a man whose name shows him to be a descendant from the German race or of Alsace-Lorraine origin. His warnings, however, remained unheeded.

In the years between 1866 and 1870 nothing was left undone for perfecting military organization both in Prussia and in the smaller German states. The Governments of the latter—as came out afterwards—were secretly bound to Prussia by military conventions. When war broke out, an attempt was made by the ultramontane section of the Bavarian Chamber—fortified by some men of Liberal views whom the events of 1866 had hopelessly embittered and betrayed into unpatriotic conduct—to carry a resolution in favor of armed neutrality. This treacherous move was quickly put down by the national enthusiasm of the masses.

I had occasion, in that tremendous crisis, when trying to counteract the bad teaching of some who had formerly been our party friends, to observe the havoc wrought by the war of 1866 in the consciences of a group of once highly patriotic men. But these were solitary instances of deplorable infatuation. They were only to be taken note of, and firmly combated, in so far as the leanings of some of these groups might, in case of a first doubtful issue, have had an injurious effect on the great national cause.

Meanwhile the grand and noble spirit of the nation carried everything before it. The southern Germans refused to make a "stab at the heart" of their brethren in the north, with whom but four years before they had had to cross swords. They would not do to Prussia as the Prussian Government formerly had done to them. Badeners, Würtembergers, Bavarians, Saxons, Hessians, Hanoverians, fought as stoutly as the Prussians themselves. The first important victories were in a large measure owing to the South German contingents under the Prussian Crown Prince.

Though the former Austrian section of the German army was no longer available, in consequence of the political exclusion of the southeastern part of the Fatherland from the remainder, the military triumph of the forces of two-thirds of the whilom Confederacy over the attempted French aggression was such as is unexampled in history. The lauded *mitrailleuse* was of no avail to the enemy. The Turcos, the Zouaves, went down like bogies. Before the iron firmness of an armed nation strong in the consciousness of right, and led by a strategist as bold as he is calm and far-seeing, one French host after the other was defeated, in spite of occasionally most stout or even heroic resistance. No such spectacle of utter defeat has been seen since men engaged in war.

In these struggles, not only the bravery, but also the regular orderliness, the good general information, and the resourceful intelligence of the average German soldier were much remarked. Whilst French officers were often in hopeless ignorance as to the geography of their own country, educated French people in whose houses German troops were quartered, were amazed at the evidence of instruction in the common soldier of that nationality, even if he did not come from the classes in which that might naturally be expected. The linguistic accomplishments of these "outer barbarians" was also something to marvel at; seeing that that branch of knowledge was until then so much neglected in France. To the French officer, his own Alsatian or Lorraine compatriot was, as a rule, the only medium for understanding German. In the German army, on the contrary, a great many men could converse with the French in their own tongue. Occasionally a puzzle arose in matters of language. One day, on the field of battle, apparently the diary of some German soldier was found, written in an alphabet no one in the French camp was able to read. The important document was sent to headquarters;

but there, again, there was nobody to make out what it contained. The strange letters were held to be a secret cipher. The document itself was supposed to be the report of the inevitable "Prussian spy." So the paper was once more sent on—this time to Paris. At last it came out that a German soldier, who happened to be one of the seven or eight Sanskrit scholars who served during that campaign, had amused himself with writing a report of the previous engagement in the sacred ancient language of India. To think that a chance bullet should possibly make an end of the store of knowledge in such a brain is melancholy indeed. Yet these men also cheerfully did their patriotic duty.

VII.

A glance at the chapter entitled "Scientific Requirements for the Examination of Ensigns," in the *Deutsche Heer- und Wehrbuch*, gives a good idea of the high standard prescribed for those purposes in the German army. The number of one-year volunteers who, by passing an examination of no mean difficulty, are entitled to that short service in times of peace, is a considerable one. Hard as the universal service, no doubt, presses upon the mass of the nation, a single paragraph of the Army Rules shows what notions of honor are connected with it. In an army got together by enlistment, like the English, the privates, in some cases, have in former times been jail-birds or of otherwise tainted character, whilst the officers were gentlemen of high social standing. Matters have considerably improved of late years as regards the privates; but still such cases occur. Now, in the German army a man who has been sentenced to imprisonment in a house of correction for a common crime is excluded from military service. That is his privilege, but it is one which marks him as infamous.

"Every German is obliged to serve in the army, and cannot be represented by another in the exercise of that duty." This is the maxim laid down in the first chapter of the military organization. The only persons freed from that obligation are the members of the reigning princely families and of those once sovereign, but now mediatized, houses of the older German Empire, to whom this exception is guaranteed by treaty. It may, however, be said that at least a number even of those princely personages did not, in the late war, avail themselves of the exception. For all German citizens the liability to service lasts from the com-

pleted seventeenth to the completed forty-second year. Of this time three years are to be spent in active service in the standing army. Four years the soldier remains in the Reserve. After that he passes for five years into the *Landwehr* and into the supplementary Reserve. This makes altogether twelve years. Subsequently he remains liable, in extreme cases, for the *Landsturm*, or last levy, which, as a rule, is not to be sent abroad, but only to be used for home defence, as garrisons of fortresses and so forth. In dress and arms no homogeneousness is prescribed for the *Landsturm;* but when led against the enemy, the men are to be made recognizable by certain military accoutrements.

By the new law, owing to the recent threatening aspect of the European situation in the East and the West, the standing army of Germany has been brought up to upwards of 500,000 men—or 550,000, if the men on leave, liable to immediate recall, are added. In case of war, this body can be brought up, by calling in the first Reserves, to upwards of 1,050,000 men. For operative purposes a further addition of upwards of 1,310,000 men may be made through the *Landwehr*. If the supplementary Reserve is put on its legs, this would give a further force of 1,465,000. Total, in round numbers, 3,800,000 men. But if the *Landsturm* also were called out, nearly 6,500,000 men would be under arms!

The prospect is a saddening one. At Germany's eastern flank, however, Russia professes to be able to raise an army of 10,000,000 men. On Germany's western flank, France may call out more than 4,000,000. Being between two Powers of historically aggressive character, Germany cannot disarm before the others do, though the heaviness of the armor presses on her most weightily. It is for her a question of national existence or extinction.

All the more desirable would it be that the French Republic —established through German victories—should devote itself to internal peaceful progress, so as to alleviate the menacing aspect of affairs, and to make it possible for the champions of international friendship to resist effectively the spread of mere militarism. Unfortunately, the Boulanger craze, against which but recently a firm stand has been made by Government and Parliament, has given little hope for such a consummation; and until this would-be revival of a demagogic Cæsarism is finally put down and really rooted out, Europe will continue, even in the midst of peace and of an Industrial Exhibition, darkly to resound with the threatening clangor of arms. KARL BLIND

WILL REASON EXTERMINATE CHRISTIANITY?

BY PROFESSOR DAVID SWING.

CHRISTIANITY is now busy with the difficult task of transferring itself from one epoch to another. It is attempting to perform its spiritual functions two thousand years away from the persons, the languages, and the modes of thought amid which it was born. When the Hebrew Scriptures are added to the New Testament, the time-ocean that rolls between the ancient and present periods is made much wider. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob are very far off; while Adam and his immediate group are almost invisible. In clear, dry, cloudless regions, mountains seem near when a hundred miles from the eye; but those lofty figures of Genesis and Exodus are made all the more remote by the presence of a haziness in the air. Not only are those heights far off, but they are clouded.

Estimating the years of Christianity from the death of its sounder, the separation between the men of Galilee and the men of England and America is so great that the Lord's ark comes into these modern fields after having made an exceeding long journey. One may wonder that the sacred emblem ever moved into the sight of the multitudes now living, so little injured in its curtains and jewels, and so full still of the original presence of God. The religion of the East can out-travel her palm-trees and her aromatic shrubs. They are more abject slaves of climate and soil. Not always have two thousand years been able to produce great changes in the intellectual world. In India and China twenty centuries were once unable to place a hat or a shoe out of style. To a plough or a wine-vessel a thousand years were as a day. Clothes decayed or were worn out, but fifty generations did not suffice to render them unfashionable to even the most fastidious taste. But from all the Western nations that permanency of things began not long since to pass away, and mankind began to change not only its ploughs and the form and color of its garments, but all the contents of its mind and heart. New forms of thought came. New starting-points of argumentation were adopted; new

ends proposed; new standards of measurement set up. So rapid was this change that reasoners who were in high fame in the fifteenth century were laughable logicians in the seventeenth.

Christianity is undergoing that shock which was made necessary by its passing over from the worlds of Abraham and the Apostles to the nations which now border the Atlantic. At the mention of the names Mediterranean, Caspian, Sea of Tiberias, Red Sea, Nile, and Jordan, the mind notes a change of landscape and seems to have made a journey into the past infinite. The Atlantic is modern; the Mediterranean ancient. It was among the islands of that eastern sea the little ships of Solomon sailed, bringing him gold and spices, a lot of peacocks, and a group of beautiful new wives. There Ulysses sailed around twenty years in search of his lost home and absent Penelope. There lived the Argive Helen, whose beauty created a war among nations, and made sea and land a battle-field upon which men wearing impenetrable armor and resistless spears involved the very gods in their contests. There all public men lived, doing and seeing wonders; there literature was a gorgeous picture-book; there art was a full partner of every Venus-born Æneas; there Scylla and Charybdis reached out many necks and opened many mouths with loud barking at the sailors passing in their shaky crafts.

To move from that sea to the Atlantic involves all that newness of feeling that would come from exchanging the galley of Telemachus for one of the steamships which now act their part in the waters between America and England. In one of the ships of Ulysses there were in reserve bags filled with wind, that was to be let out in case the sails should happen upon a dead calm. The means of propulsion now stored in the Atlantic boats are not only different, but they are confessed to be very much better. How modern, how practical, how new, how real is this great western flood! By as much as it surpasses the bays and coasts of Solomon and Achilles, by so much do the nations upon this Atlantic differ from all those which long ago went down to the sea in ships.

The problem of the Christian and of each religious and serious mind is how to make at home in this new epoch the child that has come from afar. All confess the high birth and genius of the exile, but all perceive that it has not the modern language, disposition, nor taste, nor are its old friends here—those loving friends whose affection asked few questions and whose minds saw God

so easily that it was only the work of a holy hour to see also the Son of God, and of another hour of reverence to perceive that the Son of God was also the Son of Man. It is the problem of the present to transport to America and Europe a faith and a hope that were born in Judea; or, in wider terms, to fit to the millions now living a religion elaborately wrought out by minds so widely removed from the intellect and sentiment of this, the latest, period.

The simple phenomenon is that of philosophy *versus* Christianity. In the course of events in which even Cicero saw that men and thoughts underwent great transformations, Christianity has moved away from the causes which created, or modified, or embellished its greater and minor ideas, and has reached a new country, where the mind universal is deeply colored by the philosophic spirit. Here and there have come individuals whose minds were rationalistic, but they were so few that, like Socrates, they seemed only proofs of nature's fondness for an occasional eccentric movement. This is the first age in which rationalism became a universal form of inquiry and reflection. Reason became partially popularized in the days of Pascal, but the entire seventeenth century, after arguing all of each morning about reason and by means of reason, was wont to go to the church at night and say its prayers and fall asleep at the side of the mother whose word made doubts to be both rare and wicked. What is called philosophy never came into general empire until this century. With this period her sway came as a mild republic; it is not yet known whether the gentle republic is to become a heartless despotism.

Whoever will look back upon the phenomenon of thought as it reaches out over the historic area will soon note that the bulk of it lies there in the two forms of simple declaration and logical conclusion. Except in one or the other of these two forms the past has said but little. Of these two forms, declaration was the simpler, the easier, the more childlike. It came first.

The construction of the earliest literature ought to have been easy and rapid, because the only instrument needed for its production was an active mind. That activity needed not to wait for any slow accumulation of learning; it needed not to fear a mixed figure, nor study to harmonize its utterance with scientific research. If the active mind conceived of a dog Cerberus, whose mouths were three, and whose barking was thus made three times as disagreeable as that of any actually existing dog, that mind

needed only to file a declaration which should contain a brief description of the quadruped, and from that day Cerberus became a part of perpetual literature. Thereafter Homer, Virgil, and all students and scholars down to John Milton respected the animal, and with great pride alluded to its ability to bark loud and incessantly. There has never been any desire in any land to lessen or increase the number or noisiness of the mouths, and yet all the world knows that the dog could as easily have been equipped with five or seven throats as with three. An open field lay before the inventor of this now classic creature.

As came Cerberus, came volume upon volume of the results of mental activity. Homer is a wonderful assemblage of declarations. Some man or men had been busy long before the Greek entered the creative field, for Homer found Hercules and his labors already in the world. No doubt Helen attracted lovers long before the "Iliad," just as Juliet hung over a balcony long before Shakespeare. Declarations innumerable, beautiful or grotesque, sublime or laughable, covered with tropical luxuriance the entire ancient world—Egyptian, Aryan, Greek, Hebrew, and Roman. The writers and orators of those lands and times seemed busy in a perpetual struggle after the honor of the most abundant and original utterance. This competition was peaceful and amiable. Each author respected the creations of his neighbor to such a degree that if a monster having one eye appeared in some poem that giant went onward with the single orb in his forehead. He became a fixed Cyclops, and soon seemed as actual as the horse or the elephant. When under Herodotus and Aristotle a small local effort was made to state the literal truth, the work of Herodotus became a Homer done in prose, while the fact that the elephant of Aristotle had no knee-joints, and could not lie down, justifies the suspicion that his natural history was also the product of mental activity.

An end would have come to this mental drift had Rome remained in power one or two centuries longer. The Latin race had made itself the heir of that final Greek thought which in the life of Demosthenes and Pericles resembled closely the thought of Burke and Pitt. The existence of such men as Cicero, Tacitus, and the two Plinies offers assurance that invention was giving place to the pursuit of fact; but before this new habit of thought could become fixed, luxury, vices, jealousy, and then assassination handed Rome over to chaos and the barbarians; and when

literature came back, it was once more that of amazing declaration, with this difference—that the kind of exploits recorded in Hesiod and Homer had been bartered off for the exploits of a whole Europe full of childlike barbarians or wonder-working saints.

The religious principles of the Old and New Testaments came through that long creative period, and should be expected and cheerfully confessed to contain much of what may be called intellectual assertion. Some of the most firm friends of the idea of inspiration claim that this intervention of heaven accepted of what mental custom was dominant in each time and land, and overruled it so that a declarative mind made its creations point to religion instead of pointing toward amusement or love or war. If Helen was a poetic creation, so was Lot's wife; but the two members of old fashionable society pointed to different lines of conduct—the Greek woman reaching out toward war and passionate romance; the Hebrew woman running toward the worship and service of God, and sinking in death because she did not love a noble destiny, but looked back toward a worthless life. The mental operations in the Hebrew and pagan worlds being alike, the Hebrew world contained and still contains the glory of making its men and women all point to the Creator of the heavens and the earth. The Hebrew fictions all pointed toward God. This was in their inspiration.

Rich, varied, and interesting as was that old world of letters, it was unworthy to possess the recent centuries, and so it waits away from the present, not in pain nor under rebuke, but as though resting and sleeping in the mighty chambers of history. The age of logical conclusion has dawned, even if it has not fully come. The task of the church is to carry her religion over from the epoch of assertion to the new era of logical forms. Up as though against Christianity rises the form of Philosophy. War is the result, but it will not be a war of extermination; rather a war of adjustments, and of final compromise and final friendship.

Philosophic thought differs from ancient thought in this—that philosophy is thought reasoned out. Activity of mind is no longer virtue enough. Man must possess logical powers and processes and logical taste. It was not logical in Aristotle to state that the elephant had no knee-joints. It was expected that that scientific gentleman would find the animal and carefully look into the matter. It is the aim of philosophy to be truthful in the highest degree. It being impossible to gather

up all the isolated facts in the whole world, philosophy must content itself with finding great general statements, just as the architect does not build dove-cotes, but only vast structures for the use of our statesmen or artists, or else temples for the worshipper. Over each sentence of this form of speech truth hovers either as an evident sunbeam or as the diffused light of the whole sky.

If a simple aphorism is selected such as that of some modern, "We admire the heroism of the patriot more than the ambition of the duellist," the causes of the preference, though unexpressed, are ready at one's call, and soon array themselves in all those words which express the greatness of a noble country, the human welfare that may be earned by a hero's death; and, contrasted with these words, the terms which might vainly attempt to tell the folly of the field on which the duellist slays or is slain.

By the popularity of the highest form of expression, namely, the rational form, the literature of romance and poetry is affected by the law of sympathy, and therefore the imagination of a Tennyson and a Bryant, and of their noble brothers around them, resembles no longer that of that old past, which dealt in the superhuman, in the monstrous and the grotesque; but it resembles the truths of reason, and in Byron's "Ocean" or "Thunder-storm" or "Battle of Waterloo," or in Gray's "Elegy," or Bryant's "Thanatopsis," an imagination of the highest order seems a sister of science, and heaps sweet or awful facts upon the heart. The imagination in "Thanatopsis" is as active as the same faculty in the "Arabian Nights"; only it is more reasonable, more sublime, more eloquent. In Mr. Lincoln's favorite poem, and in "The Closing Scene" of T. Buchanan Read, there is as much of the poetic spirit as in any pages of antiquity; but this fancy paints so near the world's truth that the heart weeps as though the verses were not poetry, but the history of its friends and of itself. Imagination is not a creator of falsehoods, but it is chiefly a most rare power of telling man the most beautiful and pathetic truths.

Into an age whose mind is so colored with reason that even its poetic imagery is all reasoned out like a page in ethics or high politics, Christianity is attempting to penetrate. Its conflict is not with science any more than with imagination and the prevalent logical taste. The passing years say that the inspired books were not selected with sufficient care, that they were gathered and enrolled by easy-going folk. The present also complains that inspira-

tion has been believed in without ever having been defined; that miracles were performed without a reason that bore any fair proportion to the greatness of the miracle; that often the more insignificant the reason the grander the divine intervention; that the stopping of the sun was an event too great for Joshua, and the creation of a great special fish an event too large for the Jonah.

As the atmosphere, when it lies quiet over a warm sea, becomes laden with moisture, and then, when set into motion and rolled far away up the mountain side, is compelled to let fall tremendous showers of rain because unable in its new coolness and new rarity to carry its first load, thus our religion, while lying peacefully over the low and warm Orient, absorbed a strange burden which it cannot now carry over the heights—reason's mountains. It unloads that it may rise.

Whether anything of Christianity will remain is the important and painful question. No one can answer in an absolute term, for only egotism can become a prophet and enable the minds of the present to assume to be living in and comprehending far-off times. If all the past men were the localized slaves of their own century, what law of nature has been changed to empower the present to transport itself into the future field? If the sun did not stop for Joshua, is it to shine in advance for us?

All reason can do is to study the known. It can study the methods of itself, and may look even into the composition of itself. It may observe the passing phenomena. Men now perceive that Christian sermons, Christian literature, conversation, and a deep religious faith move along in their usual power all unconscious of any absence of that supernatural which was so abundant in all the thoughts of their fathers. The story of the evil spirits and the swine may fall away without seeming to harm the Christ. If the lives of two of the most pious and saint-like Christians are viewed in all the attractive details of character, it cannot be learned from those twin hearts which one believes that the Master ordered the spirits to enter the swine, and which one thinks that some wonder-loving disciple added that incident to Christ's life after he had gone from the world. If there can thus be a harmless elimination, the conclusion is unavoidable that the term Christianity was once too large to be a logical appellation, and that it needed or needs a reduction of contents in order to become true. That term once contained all of the Mosaic age, but

recent thinkers so opened the strong box that the Mosaic treasures rolled out; it once contained Romanism, but the Protestants detached much of that quantity as being more than irrelevant; and now the term opens again, and one of the most dominant ideas of the Protestants—Calvinism—is dismissed from the feast as having no invitation, and as not wearing a wedding-garment.

A religion must have been poorly analyzed for centuries when from it can be taken without loss large parts of the Mosaic age, of Romanism, and of Protestantism, and a mass of nameless private interpretations. That much more can be eliminated from the current creed without affecting the religion of Jesus is probable.

Over the inquiry whether reason will annihilate Christianity, the student of these grave things must remember that this intellectual period does not confine itself to the task of elimination. Philosophy is not a respecter of persons. It alone can truly say with Virgil,—with names changed,—Christian and athiest "shall be treated by me without discrimination." That intellectual power which depletes the Testaments in some of their pages redoubles the radiance of other leaves, and perhaps gives more than it takes away. After having reduced the Christ to an historic character standing up in a wonderful simplicity and solitude, this most reasonable age then willingly surpasses all former times in comprehending and admiring and obeying the Son of Man. One of the most amazing and most sad of historic facts is the utter failure of the church to read aright or to imitate the character of its Master. This century is the first fully to perceive that Christ came in the name of only a spiritual empire; that his life and brotherly feeling revealed the deepest social and political truths; that peace, not war, is man's highest aim; that to live for others is greater than to live for self; that a benefactor is greater than a despot; that God is a Friend; that integrity is better than gold or genius; that the hope of immortality is an inspiration of the human mind. Reason has created an age to which Christ stands nearer than he stood to his own—a new age which rejoices that the man of Nazareth took up children in his arms, rejoices that he taught in love, that he lived as he taught, that he made the word "man" put on an eloquence which should grow in power in all these passing generations. The reason which has so reduced the bulk of Christian tenets has used its power to exalt all that is needful within the domain of religion.

It would seem that the rational faculty of man is by its limitations, rendered incapable of destroying religion, and therefore incapable of destroying the Christian religion, because Christianity, although it draws its name from Christ, does not repose upon Galilee but upon God, with the Son of Man as its visible prophet, priest, and king. The definitions of this heavenly or earthly leader may undergo modifications many; but Jesus, in all the essentials of an unrivalled worshipper and guide, is as historic as Julius Cæsar or Cicero, and thus lies beyond the reach of any destroying hand. Inasmuch as Christianity passes through the personage who gave it name, and, beyond, is based upon the Creator, along with all modern deism, reason seems debarred from working out a final ruin of the Christian's special praise and hope. If Auguste Comte found in the "ever-unrolling web" of the human race, in its thrilling experiences and powers, an object and motive of his worship of humanity, reason cannot charge folly upon those minds which may worship that Power that is greater than humanity because from it humanity came. Comte may have felt that humanity alone were an adequate basis of a worship, but he was not compelled by reason thus to rear his altar, for the rational powers are not able to affirm that the universe containing such an amazing race of mortals may not contain a greater life—that of a God. Christianity rests upon this greater life; but it differs from deism in having a Christ-element added, and this element reason may discuss and examine, but cannot remove, because its relations to religion are not logical, but simply historic. Reason may alter principles, but it cannot change history.

When it is borne in mind that the second great tenet of Christianity—immortal life—may come from the power, will, and goodness of God, and not necessarily from any functions of physical nature, then that hope lies beyond any harm from common rationalism, and the future is left as open to religion as man's past has been. It would also seem reasonable to suppose that as the mind and soul grow greater as the seasons pass, deepening in sensibility and in reflection, and able to look with more of appreciation and even awe upon the life of man, so godlike and mysterious, so a second life will be longed for more pathetically, and sought for through the eloquence of public or private worship of him from whom life came. An enlarging civilization will, perhaps, enlarge, instead of lessening, its hope of a world to come.

DAVID SWING.

THE SENSE OF HONOR IN AMERICANS.

BY PROFESSOR N. S. SHALER, OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE CENTENNIAL anniversary of our national political system has naturally led to much discussion concerning the moral tone of our existing political parties, as compared with those which controlled the government at the time of its foundation. It cannot be denied that there are elements of discouragement visible in the political conditions of to-day, which in a way warrant the criticisms of publicists. The greed of office is clearly greater, or, at least, is found in a larger proportion of the population, than it was a century ago. Our political parties appear to be more inspired by the desire for plunder than for principles. The political situation of our cities is legitimately a source of anxiety to many persons who are by no means pessimists. There are always in every community persons who despair of the Republic, and who contemn the actions of their own generation and find that all things tend to ruin. It is fit that these questioners of their own age should be heard; that from time to time those who take an optimistic view of the situation should soberly take account of the state of society and make what answer they can to those of melancholy mind. I propose, therefore, in the following pages to review some part of the evidence which may serve to show how far the political morals of this country have been affected by the first century of our national life.

In entering on an inquiry as to the comparative political morals of the two periods a century apart, we should, in the first place, note the fact that it is not safe to trust our conclusions to the evidence which is derived from any particular class of facts. We cannot, for instance, prove a general decadence of moral sense in politics by the present excessive greed of office, unless we can make sure that the conditions which led to that desire are substantially the same at the present time as formerly. It may be

that there are peculiar reasons why the greed of office should be far more manifest at present than of old. Any inquiry which seeks to determine the relative condition of political morals in periods as remote as those we are now considering must take account of the general tone exhibited by the people, and not trust to mere incidents in political behavior. The question before us concerns the essential trustworthiness of the men in the two periods. We must ascertain how far a century of political training has served to develop the faithfulness of our citizens—that spirit of devotion to the public interests which causes men to put aside or sacrifice their individual greed to ideals of public duty.

It is by no means easy to find data which can be made to serve in a satisfactory way to determine the relative condition of political morals in widely-separated periods in the development of a state. Few of the features in public conduct lend themselves to statistical interpretation. One of the points of critical importance which I have been able to seize upon concerns the conduct of our soldiers during the Revolutionary period and in the time of the Civil War. The behavior of citizens under the stress of civil war clearly affords a better clew to their essential motives than is exhibited in any other conditions of life. In such periods of disturbance men are in a measure detached from their ordinary limitations of conduct. They are, in a way, free to show the nature of their impulses without reference to the principles which guide them in the ordinary well-regulated conditions of society. If a people are by nature brutal, this quality may in peaceful civil conditions be entirely concealed, and yet appear with startling clearness in civil commotion. Thus in the case of the French, in the usual course of that well-regulated country no one would suspect the brutal motive which has never failed to manifest itself in the revolutionary periods. Just as the innate motives of men appear when they are affected by wine, so, when they are drunk with revolutionary excitement, we get an insight into the qualities of their nature which may be altogether hidden at other periods.

Taking for our problem the state of the public mind as regards the trust of political affairs, let us compare the behavior of our Revolutionary officers with that of the men engaged in the two factions of our Civil War. I shall be compelled in the main to limit the discussion to the superior officers engaged on either side

in these great American conflicts, for the reason that we have no means for adequately comparing the conduct of the common soldiers of either period. In the Revolutionary army we readily note the frequent existence of bad faith among the leading officers. The treason of Arnold, the treacherous motives of Charles Lee, the intriguing humor of Gates and his cabal, the endless self-seeking and half-hearted treachery of many other men, not only cloud the memories of those days, but doubtless did much to degrade the motives and imperil the issue of that contest. It must not be supposed that the men of that time in this country were less trustworthy than those of their day in other lands. They were the fair successors of such soldiers as John Churchill led—men who frequently looked upon public trust as a step to private gain. It was the humor of that time which we find in Arnold and the other self-seekers of our Revolutionary period. These men fought, as they well knew, with halters about their necks and with the certainty of ruin awaiting them if their cause was lost; and yet we find a great number of them anything but trustworthy. If the reader would secure a clear sense of the conditions of public trust in this period, he should read the memoirs of General James Wilkinson, which present a picture that stands in sharp and painful contrast to any which can be painted of our newer day.

As regards the measure of trustworthiness of the leading soldiers of our country, the records of the Civil War are in singular contrast with those of the Revolution. All the circumstances of our second civil war tended strongly to increase the element of untrustworthiness in the conduct of the leading men. The difficulty between the two sections was of an extremely obscure nature. In other civil wars the matter in debate has concerned the successions of a kingly house, questions of religious faith, innovations of ancient privileges, or other things which directly appeal to the personal interests of the contestants. Our Civil War involved much more complicated considerations. In large part the matter concerned the interests of the slave-holding class, but the immediate causes of the conflict rest on obscure theories of government, on the ideals of the commonwealth, which never before have to such a measure entered into a civil contest. It is a well-known fact that a large part of the contestants were in a divided state of mind. They acknowledged an allegiance to the Federal Government, against which they had to set the ties of

the several commonwealths in which they dwelt. I know by my personal experience how difficult it was to determine the measure of these diverse allegiances. It is clear that it cost the greater part of those who were by birth Southern a sore trial to determine with which duty they should cast in their lot. So, too, with at least the large part of the border settlements who cast in their lot with the union. In spirit they were with both causes. Their social, and in part their political, training inclined them to serve with the South. Their better judgment as to political duty led them towards the Federal arms. We thus see that the situation was one calculated to make men undecided as to their course of action. In another country and at another time the result would have been to breed up a host of free-lances, who would have fought first with one side, then with the other, as their changing moods were led to and fro by the varying chances of the long conflict.

The surprising part of our Civil War—perhaps the most surprising feature in that marvellous contest—was that from the beginning to the end there is no case in which an officer of any grade is known to have gone over to the enemy. Desertions of private soldiers from one side to the other were relatively rare. There were occasional cases in which men forced into the army on either side took the first chance which offered to range themselves in the army to which their principles attracted them. I have been unable to find a case in which such action was ever taken by any military unit—a company, regiment, or larger corps. Although, under the sting of defeat, a number of our officers of the Federal Army were accused of half-heartedness or treachery, the sober verdict of history has always been in their favor. It was the most satisfactory feature of our Civil War that in the worst mischances of lost battles and unsuccessful campaigns the men never lost their confidence in the moral integrity of their chiefs. Although in the curious freedom of speech which characterized our armies the men frequently condemned their leaders as fools, they never seemed to question the trustworthiness of their motives. I had an opportunity to mingle more or less with soldiers who had suffered a succession of overwhelming defeats, and to hear their camp-fire talk concerning the conditions which led to the disasters they had been compelled to endure. I have heard many expressions of indignation directed against the stupidity of their leaders, but never a sugges-

tion that they were traitors. Most commonly, even in the very extremity of disaster, the tone of criticism was characteristically jocose. The men, as is the good American fashion, took their vengeance in fun. I have heard of the case of a Confederate soldier just captured through the rash conduct of his regimental commander, who, though weeping at the mischance which had befallen him, managed to help himself to a better frame of mind by a characteristic *mot*. He remarked that "that 'ere colonel of ourn was that venturesome, he would walk across hell on a rotten rail for ten cents."

When the Confederate armies were finally broken and scattered, the separate detachments showed an indisposition to disband without the orders of their broken government. A friend of mine, who was personally engaged in the affair, has recounted to me the last stages of one of the cavalry bodies which had become separated from the Confederate authorities and had been summoned by a superior force of the Federal Army to surrender. The men had been for some time without contact with their government, and were one and all debating what it was their duty under the circumstances to do. Their answer to the summons of the Federal force was that they were then debating what course they should take—whether to try the issue of a last battle or agree to disband. For some days these two amiable enemies moved on together, camping at night within sight of each other's fires, the Federal commander preferring to await the result of the debate rather than to force the end with unnecessary bloodshed. Finally, after much discussion in the manner of a town-meeting, the conclusion was reached that it was right for them to make terms with the Federal force.

It is a well-known fact that the Confederate soldiers with singular unanimity obeyed the conditions of their surrender in the manner of good citizens. With rare exceptions they went straightway to their homes and set about the task of rehabilitating their States. The return of these warriors to the allegiance to civil government is one of the best possible evidences of the fitness of our population for the maintenance of political trusts. When we compare the social condition of the South in the years following the close of the War with that of other countries which have been the seat of protracted rebellion, we cannot but be satisfied with the civic tone of our American population.

Although the success of the Federal arms did much, of itself, to return our Northern soldiers to the state of ordinary citizens, the quiet and perfect reassumption of citizenly duty on the part of the million men who composed the Federal Army at the time when out troops were disbanded is also excellent evidence as to the tone of our people. It might have been expected that men for years released from the ordinary motives of the state would be given to marauding, and that they would form a dangerous class in the community. It remains one of the most striking spectacles in modern history that this vast body of people, so long exempt from the ordinary conditions of the state, should have immediately and quietly returned to their ordinary vocations.

Although the records of our Civil War afford, on the whole, the most conspicuous instance concerning the effect of our political training on the moral status of our population, less striking, but almost equally convincing, evidence may be found in many other departments of our public life. The instances whence we may draw such illustrations are so numerous that it is difficult to choose from them a few which may be here cited. I venture, however, to call the reader's attention to the history of our American judiciary. It is a well-known fact that in the greater part of this country, under the influence of democratic traditions, the old English method, by which judges were appointed by the chief executives of the commonwealths, has been replaced by a system in which the judiciary is immediately elected by the people. Although this elective system has, in the opinion of most judicious observers, been unfortunate in that it has led to a lowering of the grade of intelligence and legal training in the occupants of the bench, it seems clear that, save in the case of a few members of the judiciary, the system has led to no degradation in the moral quality of our legal procedure. I have had much personal acquaintance with the elective judges of one of our American commonwealths, and have made inquiries concerning the reputation of the judiciary in many other of our States. So far as I have been able to learn, they are men not only unsuspected, but, on the whole, above suspicion.

An excellent test as to the quality of these extemporized judges was afforded in the border States during the Civil War and the troubled period of reconstruction following the close of that conflict. Taken from the people, chosen by political parties,

these men were, naturally, in all cases committed to one or the other of the embittered factions. The European observer would have despaired of any even-handed justice from such men in such a period. The fact is clear that the courts of the border States during the period of the Rebellion appear to have been entirely trustworthy. I know that this was the case with the judiciary system of Kentucky during that trying time. Some years ago, after I had written for the "Commonwealth Series" a brief history of that State, it occurred to me that during and immediately after the Civil War I had been concerned in certain cases in the courts of Kentucky. Although the officers of the law were generally of the opposite political party from my own, it never crossed my mind that there was a risk of injustice from this circumstance. I made inquiries of many friends as to their own state of mind concerning the judicial system of the commonwealth during the same period, and to my surprise I found that it appeared to have occurred to no one that the courts could have been biassed by political prejudices. We must assuredly respect the trust-bearing capacities of a people when through civil war it did not occur to the citizens that political prejudices would interfere with judicial impartiality. I am sure that in no country in Europe—certainly in no Continental state, and probably not even in England—could we have had such a satisfactory state of the judicial body under similar circumstances of trial.

It seems to me that the test of an elective judiciary is at once the surest and most satisfactory trial which has been made as to the trustworthiness of our public morals. The men who fill these offices are not generally the foremost members of the bar. They are often rather cheap persons who have acquired popularity by the arts of demagogues, and yet when elected to such places of trust they seem almost invariably to rise to the sense of duty which the position demands. I do not wish to be understood as defending the system of an elective judiciary. I believe that this method of choosing judges is one of the greatest blunders of our political system. I cannot, however, refrain from expressing my admiration for the way in which these men have put aside partisanship upon their elevation to the bench. I feel, moreover, that we are entitled to set the evidence which is afforded by the conduct of these men against many unsupported assertions concerning our political degradation.

In estimating the trust-bearing capacities of our people, we have to take account of that form of social trust which has developed through the vast extension of corporate business in this country. Some critics of our society are disposed to dwell on the occasional failures of cashiers and other persons to whom moneys are confided, and to judge from these cases as to the fidelity of our people. It is difficult to make any comparison between the trustworthiness in business of our commercial men in times and conditions as far apart as the Revolutionary period and the present day. The most important, if not the most conspicuous, change in the state of our social affairs, consists in the very wide extension of the corporate system in the management of business enterprises. At the time of the Revolution corporations were rare, and only a very small share of the commercial transactions were effected by such societies. At the present time by far the larger part of the trade in this country is accomplished in the corporate way. Nearly the whole of the transportation of the country is in the hands of commercial companies, and doubtless the larger part of the manufacturing is conducted in a similar manner. The result has been the creation of a vast body of officials who are administering public trusts. Corporations owe their existence in the main to two motives: in the first place, the corporators diminish the private risk arising from their ventures; in the second place, the corporate system diminishes the interruption which arises from the death of individual proprietors. These advantages, together with those arising from the amassing of capital in large bodies and the financial strength which is thereby obtained, have led in all civilized countries, within this century, to a vast increase in this business system.

It is recognized that the gravest defect arising from the corporate system comes from the fact that the care-takers, particularly those who have money in their keeping, are usually subject to less rigid inspection and are held to a less strict account than the clerks and cashiers of private business concerns. It is not in human nature that the treasurer of a great mill or railway should feel the same sense of duty toward his trust as he would if he were doing business for a private owner. The sympathetic bond which serves to maintain the man's allegiance to the individual master does not exist in the corporate relation; it is, therefore, not fairly a matter of surprise that among the hundred thousand

or more treasurers of corporations in this country there should occasionally be found a man who betrays his trust. The surprise is, rather, that from this great army of trust-bearers the desertions are so extremely rare.

In comparing the trustworthiness of our public men of the present time and of a century ago, we must bear in mind the fact that in the present day breaches of trust on the part of persons in distinguished positions are much more generally brought to public attention than they were of old. The ancient principle embodied in the phrase that the king can do no wrong was of old extended in a certain measure to all officials of distinguished position. A conspicuous instance of this fact—one which should go far to qualify our criticism on the statesmen of to-day—has recently been forced upon my attention. In looking over the history of Harvard College, I came upon the little-known and very curious records concerning the relation of the college to its sometime treasurer, John Hancock. This patriot was, in the time when the colonies revolted from Great Britain, the treasurer of Harvard College. His office placed in his hands the whole of the funds of the institution. The record seems to show that Hancock for a time appropriated to his own use the money of the college which was intrusted to his keeping. In any collegiate institution in New England at the present day such a malfeasance would lead to the immediate prosecution of the offender, who would be compelled to make restitution, or suffer for his conduct. No such fate awaited Hancock. In place of prosecution, the corporation, doubtless knowing what was best for the interests they had in hand, pleaded with him with piteous insistence for nearly twenty years, during which he paid little or no attention to their communications. He went about his affairs, occupying many distinguished offices, holding for a term the place of Governor of the Commonwealth, and finally, in a somewhat contemptuous way, after the college had been for two decades in distress for the money he had withheld from its treasury, he settled his accounts.

I do not mean to suggest that such unworthy conduct was common among the men of the Revolutionary period; but it seems to me that this case shows plainly how easy it was for the men of that time who held distinguished positions to escape from the swift and destructive criticism which now overtakes the trust-breaker in any social position whatsoever.

There can be no doubt that there are very serious evils in our political system which were unknown to our Revolutionary forefathers. Some of these evils—as, for instance, the flagrant abuse of public office for partisan purposes—are the shame of our time. The conditions which have operated to fix this evil in our administrative work do not seem to me, however, to be due to any diminution in the measure of fidelity to trust among our people. On the contrary, it appears to me that a fair survey of our political life serves to indicate that the trust-maintaining power of our people has gained in the first century of our development. This gain has been made despite the vast increase of the inhuman relations which have arisen in business affairs through the extension of the corporate work. It seems to me also that the element of trustworthiness in the work of the soldier, as well as of the citizen, shows no loss. I think that an examination of the facts would indicate a similar gain in the more purely political parts of our public life, and that in the field of legislation, as well as in the executive work of the country, no debasement has taken place in the first century of our experience with republican institutions.

N. S. SHALER.

GREAT BRITAIN AND THE CONFEDERACY.

BY HENRY CLEWS.

In a recently published book of mine, "Twenty-Eight Years in Wall Street," occurs the following passage:

"There was a secret alliance formed between Napoleon and the British Cabinet—an international conspiracy on a large scale—to demolish the liberties of this country, pounce upon the wreck, and then share the spoils between these two powerful pirates. How this was planned and subsequently averted would form, if fully written up, one of the most interesting chapters in the voluminous library of statecraft, and would take most of the political sensation out of the best efforts of Machiavelli, Talleyrand, and Prince Metternich. I can only glance at the leading features of the diabolical scheme, and show how Wall Street men were again promptly in the breach at the proper moment."

To this the Hon. William E. Gladstone takes exception in a letter to me, in which he says:

"Having expressed my interest in the portions of your work which I read on the day of its arrival, I think it would be less than ingenuous if I did not, after reading what relates to the Cabinet of Lord Palmerston, on page 56 and in the following chapter, make some reference to it.

"Allow me to assure you that, so far as that Cabinet is concerned, you have been entirely misled in regard to matters of fact. As a member of it, and now nearly its sole surviving member, I can state that it never at any time dealt with the subject of recognizing the Southern States in your great Civil War, excepting when it learned the proposition of the Emperor Napoleon III. and declined to entertain that proposition, without qualification, hesitation, delay, or dissent.

"In the debate which took place on Mr. Roebuck's proposal for the negotiation, Lord Russell took no part, and could take none, as he was a member of the House of Lords. I spoke for the Cabinet.

"You will, I am sure, be glad to learn that there is no foundation for a charge which, had it been true, might have aided in keeping alive angry sentiments happily gone by."

While it is true, as Mr. Gladstone states, that the British Cabinet repudiated the proposition of Napoleon III. for recognition of the Southern States, it was in its corporate and official capacity that it did so, and for diplomatic purposes. The three great leaders of the Cabinet at that time were Palmerston, Gladstone, and Bright, the last-named being the only one who had any faith in the ultimate triumph of the Union arms and the abolition of slavery by reason of the war. Mr. Bright also deeply regretted the bloodshed, as he did in all cases of war, but he believed in the

Union. Mr. Gladstone was a Southern sympathizer, and the touching reference which he made during the Roebuck debate to those "heroic people struggling for independence" would have done honor to his favorite Homer. While that debate was in progress in the early days of July, 1863, and while the London *Times*, the organ of the British Government, was exulting over the successful invasion of Pennsylvania by Lee's troops, the tide of battle had been already turned at Gettysburg, and the flower of Southern chivalry were in rapid retreat towards Richmond. The *Times* of the 8th, a few days after the battle, wrote editorially: "It is to be hoped that General Lee will at least make this invasion sufficiently effective to disgust the Northern people with the war, and to shame their leaders out of their boasting and conceit." Mr. Gladstone seemed to have clearer foresight of events at this time than the editor of the organ of the Government, for he counselled suspension of both judgment and action until the momentous crisis which he foresaw should have been passed.

The result, however, was very different from what he expected, for he was a believer, in common with the majority of Englishmen, in the eventual success of the South. Yet towards the end of the debate he appeared to have some misgivings as to the outcome of the war. He was averse to intervention chiefly because the French and English would both be suspected of interested motives by the other Powers and denounced by public opinion generally, and he would, perhaps, have advised England to take part as a prominent peacemaker, if all or most of the other Powers of Europe had joined in the same laudable object. Napoleon and England would naturally be regarded with suspicion owing to their respective footholds in North America, the one in Canada and the other in Mexico. Mr. Gladstone, like the ancient war-horse, appeared to scent the battle (of Gettysburg) from afar, and probably had a prophetic foreboding of the success of the Union arms, although it was hard for him to breast the tide of popular opinion directly. He did it, however, indirectly, and not the less effectively, by pleading diplomatic prudence and expediency. The strong points which Mr. Gladstone made on these grounds had their full effect upon Parliament when indorsed by Mr. Bright, who spoke afterwards and reminded the House that "the government of the United States had been contending for its life and for human

freedom," and pointed out the consequences of intervention in the following eloquent terms :

> "I see the most instructed people and the most wealthy—if you take the distribution of wealth among the whole people—will have left in their hearts a wound which probably a century may not heal, and the posterity of some of those who now hear my voice may look back with amazement, and I will say with lamentation, at the course which was taken by the honorable and learned gentleman [Mr. Roebuck] and by such honorable members as may choose to follow his leading.'

Bright further denounced Roebuck and Lindsay as "co-conspirators with the Emperor" to drag England into a course or policy which would be as hostile to her interests as it would be degrading to her honor. These well-timed denunciations from Gladstone and Bright, backed up by similar, though hardly so strong, language from Palmerston, had the effect of keeping England from committing a diplomatic blunder worse than any in her history, even exceeding that which fomented the Crimean War. The event illustrates the marvellous power of a few leading minds, with right and logic on their side, against a host with nothing but low and grovelling selfish purposes. Relief from the cotton famine and the glittering prospects of free trade were the strong and alluring motives which prompted the majority in Parliament to take sides with the South. The starving condition of the operatives of Lancashire appealed far more strongly to the feelings of every Englishman than any patriotic idea to avenge Bunker Hill. But these motives, though appealing powerfully to the animal part of the British nature, were ignored by the three highly enlightened statesmen just referred to and a few of their followers. The Cabinet was not by any means unanimous, except through severe party discipline, but rather, I should judge, the other way, and the most difficult part of the arduous task which devolved upon the three astute diplomats in question was to prevent the consideration of the subject by Parliament (in which event the result was already a foregone conclusion), and obtain permission from that eminent body to leave the matter to the Government.

It was here that Mr. Gladstone's fine points as an able tactician, as well as a persuasive orator, were displayed in bold belief, like those of one of his great classic heroes, namely, the Pylian sage Nestor, although Roebuck was not sufficiently strong to bear comparison with Achilles, whose passion and "youthful heat" Nestor

endeavored to calm. Yet, in spite of the fact that Roebuck, Lindsay & Co. had a majority in Parliament, and at that moment, in all probability, a majority in the Cabinet as well, this Nestor of the English Parliament, with the aid of half a dozen trusted colleagues, out of a Cabinet of fifteen, was so successful in calming the passions of these English champions of the "Lost Cause" that Roebuck was prevailed upon to withdraw his motion for intervention, which, if carried, would, no doubt, have embroiled the nation in war with the United States (the North); war being the inevitable result, as was argued by Mr. Gladstone, in all historical and diplomatic parallel cases.

Looking at the question in the light of these facts and others elicited in the debate on intervention, I think it is safe to state that probably the majority of the Cabinet, and certainly the large majority in Parliament, were morally responsible for imparting aid and comfort to the South, and thus prolonging the struggle and the effusion of blood which they seemed so anxious to stop, although, through the able and praiseworthy tactics of its leaders, the Cabinet narrowly escaped technical and official responsibility. And if the event of a successful invasion, even temporarily successful,—according to the most anxious wishes of the London *Times*,—had been realized, it would have been impossible, I believe, for the chief of those leaders to stem any longer the tide of British opinion through Parliament for intervention, any more than Nestor himself was able to restrain Thetis's godlike son from threats of violence towards the "king of men." So I agree with Mr. Gladstone that I was not technically justified in using the words "British Cabinet," and that the word "Parliament" would have been less objectionable; but I am still of the opinion that close investigation of the diplomatic relations between the Emperor of the French and certain members of Parliament will show that I was correct in the "spirit," if not in the "letter," in my remarks on the subject of British intervention. I am highly gratified, however, to acknowledge Mr. Gladstone's correction in the kindly spirit in which it has been offered, and especially in the conciliatory tone which it breathes towards the United States.

It would seem from this expression of the eminent statesman, as well as from a great deal that he has said in his famous essay, "Kin Beyond Sea," about our great country, that he has materially modified his opinions regarding the meritorious nature

of the great struggle to preserve the Union. He said, in concluding his great speech against intervention:

"It is not from any belief that this war is waged for any adequate or worthy object on the part of the North that I would venture to deprecate in the strongest terms the adoption of the motion of the honorable gentleman [Mr. Roebuck], but don't let us run the risk of making worse that which is already sufficiently horrible, and adding to the deadly feud other feuds and other quarrels which carry still wider desolation over the face of the earth."

Mr. Gladstone had evidently here in his mind the probability of a European war in case of interference on the part of England and France, and this was one of the great restraining motives which he placed strongly, rather by inference than in plain terms, before the minds of the interventionists in Parliament. His closing remarks show that he was influenced by the very broadest principles of statesmanship, as well as the most tender sympathies with suffering humanity, and that in spite of the feelings and interests of almost the entire adult population of England, he was capable of rising to the very highest plane of thought in international politics, laying aside all prejudices, and adhering to the rule which he laid down at the beginning of his speech, to regard the question simply as a "judge on the bench or the juryman in the box" would do. But his indomitable efforts throughout only go to show the great forces with which he had to contend, and that there were men deep in the councils of the Cabinet plotting to undo his work and conspiring with the Autocrat of France to destroy our great Republic. The admissions of Lord Cowley to Mr. Lindsay are, I think, quite pertinent to this view of the subject. He said, while he was the representative of the British Government at Paris:

"I don't think my Government is prepared to act at present. The proper moment for action has passed, and further developments must be awaited."

Now, making all due allowance for the evasive character of diplomatic conversation, this clearly implies that some responsible party connected with the British Cabinet had been entertaining the subject of Southern recognition, for it cannot be supposed that Lord Cowley was either a fool or guilty of palpable deception when he talked to a member of Parliament on a subject then of the most vital interest to England and probably to the peace of Europe.

With reference to Mr. Gladstone's statement that Lord Rus-

sell took no part in the debate on Mr. Roebuck's proposal for the recognition of the South, it may be stated that Lord Russell was the Secretary of Foreign Affairs and had much to do indirectly with the debate, and was, of course, considerably involved in the councils of the Cabinet. It will be seen by reference to Hansard's reports that the Foreign Office was gravely suspected of evasion, by Mr. Roebuck and his followers, in the matter of concealing a communication from the Emperor on the subject of recognition, and Lord Russell in a speech in the House of Lords warmly resented the imputation, and quoted Baron Gros, the French Ambassador, to prove that no official communication had passed from the Emperor through him. The Foreign Office was carefully searched, but no discovery of any note from his Majesty (inadvertently pigeon-holed) could be found. The Emperor charged Lord Russell with breaking diplomatic faith with him on a former occasion, in permitting Lord Lyons, at Washington, to show to Mr. Seward a privileged communication expressing His Majesty's views on recognition. It appears, however, that the Emperor had made some kind of promise to Mr. Roebuck to send an official note to the Government as soon as Parliament should "sound Lord Palmerston" on Southern affairs. The inference would, therefore, appear that the member for Sheffield was under the impression, perhaps delusively, that Palmerston was of his opinion, and had probably communicated this impression privately to the Emperor. Hence may have arisen his suspicion that the Foreign Office was acting evasively. However, the *Moniteur*, the organ of the Emperor, did not bear Roebuck out in this opinion, perhaps for judicious reasons, as it stated that the probability was that the Emperor had not gone any further in his interview with Roebuck and Lindsay at Fontainebleau than to give them authority to "sound Palmerston." The Emperor was well aware that a very long plummet-line would be required to accomplish this diplomatic feat.

The conversation of Mr. Lindsay, the member for Sutherland, with Mr. Disraeli, as reported by Mr. Slidell to the Confederate Government, sheds a ray of valuable light on the part which Lord Russell had been playing into the hands of Lord Palmerston in the game of diplomacy, about the time that Napoleon charged the British Government with attempting to use His Majesty "to draw the chestnuts from the fire." After explaining

that Lord Russell refused to receive a communication from the Emperor through Mr. Lindsay, alleging that he could only do so through the regular diplomatic channel, Slidell continues:

"Lindsay then saw Disraeli, who expressed great interest in our affairs and fully concurred in the views of the Emperor. He said that he had the best reason to believe that a secret understanding existed between Lord Russell and Seward, that England would respect the Federal blockade and withhold recognition, that, if France would take the initiative, any course she might adopt to put an end to the present state of affairs would undoubtedly be supported by a large majority in Parliament, and, knowing this, Lord Russell would give a reluctant assent to this—to avoid what would otherwise follow, a change of ministry."

Although this expression of opinion by Disraeli, as reported, is somewhat obscure and ambiguous, it indicates that certain persons in the confidence of the Government were playing a double part, and that Southern recognition had been resolved upon in the inner circles of British diplomacy. It seems curious that the Emperor and Disraeli both use the name of Lord Russell, as his power at that time was only of an executive character. The scope of the conversation would more naturally lead to the conclusion that Slidell intended to use the name of Palmerston, and simply spoke of Lord Russell as the mouthpiece of the Prime Minister and the Government. In spite of this ambiguity, however, the general meaning of Disraeli's words is clear, and his testimony at this time is important, as he kept himself well informed on inside affairs, as far as it was possible for an outsider to do so. He was fairly posted on American affairs also, although he did on one occasion, in the heat of debate, commit the geographical blunder of locating St. Louis in Canada. But he only got history slightly mixed, and was for the moment thinking of the time of Louis XIV., when there was a town of that name in the New Dominion.

There is one point on which Mr. Gladstone has been very much misunderstood by many newspapers and writers in this country. They have presumed that, because he was a believer in the success of the South, he was, therefore, in favor of breaking up the Union. This is an error, and does Mr. Gladstone serious injustice. He proclaimed emphatically in that debate that he had never agreed with those who were in favor of breaking up the Union.

A mingled feeling of candor and justice compels me to state that, in the light of the history which this criticism of my book

by Mr. Gladstone has called up afresh, both England and the United States are greatly indebted to him. As he was then spokesman of the Cabinet, his eloquent and magnetic power was highly instrumental in tiding it over a diplomatic and international difficulty, and in steering it clear of the risk of "keeping alive angry sentiments," to which he refers in his kind and polite letter. He has, furthermore, been at great pains since then, in his speeches and especially in that inimitable and comprehensive essay to which I have already referred, to harmonize the feelings and elevate the humane and Christian aspirations of the two great English-speaking nations. If there were a few more statesmen of his calibre and peace-loving qualities, we might be hopeful that some generation not far in the distant future would realize the beatific vision of Isaiah, when the people "shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks," and not "learn war any more."

In conclusion, I wish the Grand Old Man many happy days, and, if he should live to celebrate his centennial, that he may see the event crowned with the realization of some of his highest philanthropic aims, and some of the best reforms which he has proposed for the consolidation, solidity, and prosperity (without further extension) of the Empire on which "the sun never sets" —always provided that amid these happy issues one of his noblest desires shall be respected and inculcated, namely, that that Empire shall be at peace with all nations.

HENRY CLEWS.

THE CASH VALUE OF A BOOK REVIEW.

BY OLIVER B. BUNCE.

I AM ASKED to tell the readers of books and the readers of magazines what is the cash value of a book review. By cash value is, of course, meant influence upon sales. I must begin by confessing that the court is asked for a decision upon a subject in which the testimony is very contradictory, and the opinions of experts not at all in agreement. There are books that are great successes despite the unfavorable judgment of the critics; there are books that the critics praise highly, but which the public persistently neglect; and there are books upon whose merits readers and critics are for the most part of one mind. How far this latter conjunction has been brought about by the influence of the book column is not easy to say. A few illustrations drawn from well-known facts in the publishing world may throw what light there is upon the question.

When that remarkably successful novel, "Ben Hur," was first published, it was received with indifference. At the end of the first year, if not considered a failure, it was a long way from being looked upon as a success. But about this time, long after the reviewers had ceased to review it and the publishers to advertise it, the book began to sell. The movement was slow at first, but it steadily increased in force and volume. The book reached its tenth thousand, then its twentieth, then almost by a jump it was credited with its fiftieth thousand, and now, far beyond its hundredth thousand, it stands one of the monumental successes of the day. Here we have a success in which the reviewer took no part. His approval or disapproval of the book no one seems to have heeded, but long afterwards, when his criticism had vanished into the spaces into which so much that is said soon disappears, there rose a tide whose source was innumerable

rivulets of personal opinion. The book began to be talked about; there went thither and hither, from social circle to social circle, the mouth-to-mouth comment and approval which are a thousand-fold more potent than the best-considered written criticism, and the whole country soon became its readers. It is doubtful whether any book becomes widely successful without this social advertising. The best that criticism commonly does is to give an impulse to this movement; to set here and there people talking about the book that it commends.

Perhaps the most signal instance of the direct value of a book notice is Mr. Gladstone's essay on "Robert Elsmere." But this in all the circumstances is so exceptional that it cannot be justly cited as an instance of the reviewer's influence. That the foremost man in all England, one who stands to many millions as scarcely less than a prophet and a seer, should devote himself to the analysis of a novel was of itself sufficient to set people everywhere inquiring about the book and discussing it. Then the story of "Robert Elsemere" is controversial in character. People took sides, debated its arguments, affirmed or denied its conclusions, and consequently every one felt compelled to read the story in order to take part in the controversies everywhere going on. The pulpit, the parlors, the press, were all praising or dispraising the book. Everything, in fact, combined to make i ts success more successful. How much of all this was due to Mr. Gladstone's article it is impossible to say. But supposing that all the reviews, criticisms, and comments with which the periodical press teemed had to be paid for, what would have been their cash value then to the publishers? Would not the cost, in all likelihood, have greatly exceeded the returns? I suspect that, in every case where a book has become successful by virtue of what is said of it in the press, the net value to the publishers would be *nil* if the criticisms were charged against it at so much per line.

There must, moreover, be a very general concert of action if criticism produces any noticeable effect. An article merely here and there scarcely stirs the sluggish surface of public opinion. When a novel by George Eliot appeared, the whole orchestra, as it were, burst into strains of eulogy—first fiddles and second fiddles, the big drums and the little drums, the cymbals and the wind instruments, all united in a tremendous crash and flare until the very deaf heard. Much of this, it cannot be doubted, was due

to the master leader, Lewes, who knew how to set the whole London press jumping. It is, naturally, impossible for the most indifferent reader not to be influenced by an assault of this kind; he must read perforce, whether his inclinations are that way or not. I recollect well when Thackeray's daughter produced her first novel. The book was charming and deserved high praise, but it was surprising to see the entire London press—the daily papers, the weekly papers, the magazines—bursting into a concert of enthusiastic and expansive enconiums. When the mighty deep rises in this way, a book can scarcely fail to rise triumphantly into public favor. In our country it is not easy, if even possible, to secure similar unity of action; and then there must needs be the book that would justify it and the man whose influence could command it. Not even Lewes could rattle his thunder with anything less than a George Eliot.

There is also, occasionally, an apparent result from editorial commendation, when the writer is known and is believed to be speaking with candor. It has been said that the great London success of Conway's "Called Back" was due to a send-off given it by Labouchère in *Truth*, and that "The House on the Marsh" was similarly indebted to Edmund Yates in *The World*. It is easy, however, in these things to mistake coincidence for cause and effect. In the same way, Mr. Stedman's cordial praise of Sidney Luska's first book gave it, very likely, an impetus. But these are scarcely instances of the influence of reviews: they have the weight of personal sanction, and carry conviction in a manner that the regulation notice never does.

When we withdraw our consideration from a few exceptional successes to the average book, it is difficult to trace the influence of the review. It is notorious that the most widely-read of all our American novelists never won the favor of the critics, and very likely the critics were right. The case of the English novel, "The Silence of Dean Maitland," is similar, on a much smaller scale, to that of "Ben Hur." It was coldly received by the press, but after some months began slowly to make its way, and by no other means than the discernment of individual readers. The critics did not, at first, either here or in England, discover the quality of this novel; in both countries it was found out by the public. But there have been many instances of unexpected successes, of books that have won their way without extraneous aid; as there are also

instances of unexpected failures, of books the public would not touch despite the blandishments of the reviewers and the seductive assurances of the advertisements. Then there are notices and notices. Mr. Haggard's "Solomon's Mines" was brought into notice by numerous charges, in the London literary journals, of plagiarism. These accusations were so numerous and so persistent that a question arose whether they were not simply devices to draw attention to the book? Every one knows that there is no better means of bringing a book into notice than a sharp controversy. And yet nothing is certain. A device that appears to work well in one case wholly fails in another; praise that seems to send one book bounding is listened to unheeded in the instance of another.

It has been said, however, by some pessimists that no one ever reads a book review. "There are but three persons," once said a caustic cynic, "that read a book review—the author of the book, the writer of the review, and the publisher of the book." If there is any truth in this, it relates to favorable reviews only. An unfavorable criticism is sure to be read by all the author's friends, by all his rivals, by all his publisher's rivals, and by everybody that likes to see a target well hit. The thing that makes a review acceptable to readers generally is salt, and not saccharine matter. It is possible, indeed, that the real usefulness of a review lies in this direction. People do not at heart want to be told that a given book is worth reading; it is much more satisfactory to them to discover that it has no claim upon their attention. With busy men it is a relief to have the books that need to be read narrowed down to the fewest number possible. A reviewer, therefore, that condemns freely is just the man they want. His mission is to help the book-buyer keep his money.

And there is another way in which the reviewer serves the book-buyer. Extended notices that take out the heart of a book, that describe its scope, make plain its purpose, copy its best paragraphs, give hosts of readers pretty much everything they want. Their curiosity is satisfied, and they can talk about the book in most circles with some show of understanding. In fact, with the great multitude of books coming from the press it would be impossible for most readers to do more than taste each newcomer in this fashion. But, this being true, is not the question we are considering mistakenly put? If the real function of a

notice is to deter a reader by depreciating a book, or to relieve him by a long analysis from what otherwise he might consider an intellectual obligation, then the cash value of a review is, so far as the publisher is concerned, on the negative side. The real issue in this case obviously is, what is the cash value of a book notice to book-buyers? If this surmise is correct, are not publishers who send books to editors for review like the engineer who is "hoist with his own petar"?

Besides those that read a review because a friend is hurt, or an enemy impaled, or a smart piece of injustice done, and those that read it because it is cheaper and easier than to procure the volume itself, there are a class that read it because they have read the book. A review, after all, is often in a strange language to every one not acquainted with the book under discussion; but if this has been read, the comments of the reviewer have more significance, his points are better understood, and his praise or dispraise more keenly relished or disrelished. There is always great pleasure in comparing opinions, and no doubt immense satisfaction in finding one's own discernment confirmed. So much greater is the interest in reading a review after, rather than before, reading the book that I often wonder whether this is not the best purpose of criticism. Of what significance is an essay on "Hamlet" to a man who knows not "Hamlet"? Who can more than half understand an analysis of a new essay in philosophy or a new romance of character and motive, when nothing else is known but what the reviewer reveals? If I may judge by my own experience and personal likings, a review is of little interest unless the book is already, in some measure at least, familiar. But, if this is true, what, again, becomes of the cash value of the review?

Leaving this narrow monetary side of the question, it is certain, I think, that the aggregate influence of book reviews is an aid to literature. It may be difficult to trace this influence in many instances; it may often glance without effect, and sometimes repress rather than help deserving productions; but, as a whole, it no doubt widens the knowledge of literature and nourishes the taste for it. It is not, indeed, certain that literature would be possible to any large extent if there were no heralds to proclaim and no chorus to celebrate it.

O. B. BUNCE.

LEAVES FROM A DRAMATIST'S DIARY.

BY DION BOUCICAULT.

PREVIOUSLY to 1850 the condition of the English dramatist resembled that of the author described in "Gil Blas," or more recently depicted by Charles Reade in "Peg Woffington." The greater number of the literary men exercising this craft depended upon other means of livelihood. Planché was in a government office; Dance held a clerkship in the Court of Bankruptcy; Robert Bell was editor of the *Atlas;* Talfourd was a sergeant-at-law; Bulwer was a man of large private property; Tom Taylor was a professor in a college; Mark Lemon kept a public house; Douglas Jerrold struggled miserably until he became connected with *Punch;* Sheridan Knowles tried vainly to keep his head above water—he deserted the stage for the pulpit. Boucicault, Morton, and, somewhat later, Tom Robertson relied solely on the Drama for an income. Boucicault was the first to strike his flag; he went on the stage as an actor. Morton fell to pieces, and Tom Robertson endured for many years such extremes of want—even of hunger—that his sufferings during this terrible period contributed largely to the cause of his early death. While managers and star actors were reaping a golden harvest by means of the dramatic works furnished by the phalanx of dramatists, the authors received a miserable pittance of thirty dollars a week for the use of such plays as "Richelieu," "The Rent Day," and "London Assurance." Boucicault sold "The Willow Copse" for five hundred dollars, and he received three hundred for "The Corsican Brothers." For the four years between 1844 and 1848 he had resided in Paris, where he found the French dramatists reaping the principal profits derived from their works, and occupying the position in the Drama to which their share in the entertainment clearly entitled them. "Your English managers

and stars," remarked St. Georges, "remind one of the Danish warriors who drank their wine out of the skulls of their foes."

The French method gave the dramatic author one-tenth of the gross receipts of each performance of his play, or, to be more correct, the theatre paid 10 per cent. of its receipts for the pieces played at each performance ; so, if only one piece was performed, the author took the whole amount, which to a fair success realized from seventy-five to one hundred dollars a night.

On his return to London, Boucicault sought the leading members of the Dramatic Authors' Society and proposed to reform its principles so as to conform to the French method. No encouragement was extended to this proposal by the English authors, while it aroused a bitter feeling amongst managers and leading actors towards this literary anarchist, who proposed to disturb an old-established system. Many of the dramatists, while agreeing to the movement on principle, assured him that it would never be accomplished and urged him to relinquish the effort. He was defeated. It will be seen presently that, ten years after this defeat, he brought forward another project for the emancipation of the dramatic author, and, single-handed, established this entirely new method, which not only swept away the Dramatic Authors' Society of England and its antiquated system, but which was destined to change the face of the theatrical world in Great Britain, and subsequently in Europe and in the United States. It abolished stock companies to a great extent in Europe, and still more so in the United States. This result was not intended or foreseen. It was, however, the inevitable consequence of the process by which the author was made the star and the actor and manager were relegated to the back seats.

But we are forestalling events. Finding himself defeated and disregarded by the London managers, Boucicault turned his face to the West, and on the 18th September, 1853, landed in New York. It was not a city. It was a theatre. It was a huge fair. Bunting of all nationalities and of no nationality was flaunting over the streets. Poles of liberty accentuated the "Rights of Man." Bands of music preceded processions of a dozen boys bearing flags and tattered targets. Irish was spoken at the wharves, German in the saloons, French in the restaurants. But the chiefest feature in this polyglot city was its boyhood. A boy in heart, but a man, and a very shrewd one, in head !

Boucicault was surprised to find the American theatres superior in every respect to the theatres in England. The New York audiences were keener and more sincere; their taste was of a finer kind; their appreciation was quicker. The plays were better acted. He had left behind him in London no such comedians as Blake, Burton, Walcot, Holland, Lester Wallack, and Laura Keene. The great school of pantomime, which became extinct in England after the death of Grimaldi, flourished in the United States under the Ravels. Neither the press nor the people seemed to understand this artistic wealth. They had been taught subjection to London and to Paris in all such matters, and willingly recognized their inferiority. They had no drama of native growth. They had no laws protecting copyright in the performance of dramatic works. The casual contributions to American dramatic literature from George Boker, Dr. Bird, and others, were *publici juris;* any one was at liberty to perform them freely. In the presence of such an impediment, the existence of an American drama was impossible. It required three years' labor to remove it. In 1856 a brief statute was passed by Congress investing the author of a drama or the composer of a musical work, in addition to the sole right of printing and publishing, with the sole right also of representing it or permitting it to be represented.

Boucicault had used these three years in study of the American people, their tastes, and the direction of their intellectual appetites. The poetic and romantic drama had no longer its old charm; the actual, the contemporaneous, the photographic had replaced the works of imagination. It was in turning over the *Illustrated Journal* that the idea struck him that the stage might be employed in a similar manner to embody and illustrate the moving events of the period. The Russian war, the Indian mutiny, the adventures of Dr. Kane in polar regions, the slave question, were all live subjects of that period. But the most immediate and burning matter in the public mind was the Indian mutiny. The news of the massacre at Cawnpore had filled the world with horror, when we learned that a small garrison of Europeans were shut up in Lucknow, besieged by an overwhelming force of Indians. This attitude was seized on by Boucicault when he wrote "Jessie Brown, or the Relief of Lucknow," and this play was produced in New York while the siege was still in progress. The result fulfilled all the expectations of the author, who soon

followed this drama with the "Streets of New York" and "The Octoroon, or Life in Louisiana." This last work was produced in December, 1859, and, accidentally, on the day when John Brown sent his soul marching on ahead of Emancipation.

At this time Boucicault entered into an engagement with Miss Laura Keene to perform for five months at the Olympic Theatre. He opened in "Jeanie Deans," which proved one of the most successful of his efforts. He followed this drama with "Vanity Fair," a comedy in three acts, which failed. This work had been relied on to carry the engagement prosperously to the end of May; twelve weeks of disaster lay ahead, in which all the profits of the season, and more, too, must inevitably disappear.

"Have you nothing—no subject, no play half written? Can you think of nothing to replace this unlooked-for collapse?" pleaded Miss Keene.

"I have nothing," replied Boucicault, "excepting a very poor sketch of 'Little Dorrit' and another of 'Bleak House'; but let us meet to-morrow and talk it out."

It was a bitter night, and the sleet driven by a northerly blast lashed the author's face as he turned up Broadway. A few doors from the theatre a dim light in a cellar showed that a thrifty little Italian, who sold cheap publications and small stationery, invited the belated pedestrian to buy a home-made cigar. His name was Brentano. Descending into the den, where he knew he should find the usual display of ten-cent literature, Boucicault asked for two novels, over which he intended to spend the hours of night. Brentano pointed to a shelf where a scanty row of cheap novels represented his stock in trade; from these the visitor selected a dozen at hazard, and with the pockets of his overcoat stuffed he pushed his way through the sleet and the darkness to Union Square, near which he resided. The following morning Miss Keene received this letter:

"My Dear Laura:

"I have it! I send you seven steel engravings of scenes around Killarney. Get your scene-painter to work on them at once. I also send a book of Irish melodies, with those marked I desire Baker to score for the orchestra. I shall read act one of my new Irish play on Friday; we rehearse that while I am writing the second, which will be ready on Monday; and we rehearse the second while I am doing the third. We can get the play out within a fortnight.

"Yours,

"D. B."

Amongst the books picked up at Brentano's was, haply, "The

Collegians," by Gerald Griffin. Throwing it aside, Boucicault evolved "The Colleen Bawn."

These incidents may appear too trivial for such particular record, but their results will be seen to have a signal importance. The least important was the revolution effected by this play in what may be termed the Irish drama and the representation of Irish character. But the adventures of "The Colleen Bawn" in England will be seen to have contributed mainly to a fundamental change in theatrical affairs throughout the world.

In September, 1860, it was produced in London, at the Adelphi Theatre, and its success enabled Mr. Boucicault to carry out the plans he had vainly endeavored to put into operation in 1852. He refused to allow "The Colleen Bawn" to be played on royalty or fees. He engaged four comedians, Mr. John Drew, Mr. Sloane, Mrs. Sloane, and Mrs. Hudson Kirby, and instructed them in the principal characters. He offered the play as the star, supported by this group of American comedians. He experienced much resistance on the part of managers in the provincial theatres, but at last his terms were accepted, the play became the thing, and the author received half the gross receipts. A second and a third company were organized and sent out. In the following year he sent out "The Streets of London," and in 1865 he sent out three companies with "Arrah na Pogue." The leading dramatic authors, perceiving the very large profits accruing from this new method, began to secede from the Dramatic Authors' Society, and to follow the new method, under which the name of the author of the play was starred and his importance recognized. The provincial theatres became so overrun with these new companies that managers proposed to the authors to send out, not groups, but entire companies of comedians: by such means the managers could dispense with local companies altogether. This suggestion was accepted, and thus "stock companies" were swept away.

At a meeting of the French dramatists and composers, held in Paris in 1866, Mr. Boucicault described this new method of harvesting the provincial theatres. The shrewd and practical Frenchmen adopted the idea at once. But it was not until after 1872 that the United States finally gave up stock companies and adopted the new system. It is not our business here to discover how far the stage was benefited by this new order of its affairs.

Mr. Boucicault was an author; his object was to benefit his craft —to obtain for the dramatist not only the place of honor at the entertainment, but the largest share of the loaves and the fishes. When the most notable authors of the day ceased to place their new works upon the list of the Dramatic Authors' Society of England, that institution fell into decay, and, I believe, has disappeared.

* * * * * *

In the summer of 1865, Mr. Joseph Jefferson arrived in London from Australia, at an unfortunate moment. American comedians were not regarded with favor by the London public. The failure of Mr. Owens was of recent date. Mr. Jefferson had no new plays. Those characters which Mr. Boucicault had written for him—*Salem Scudder*, in "The Octoroon," and *Caleb Plummer*, in "Dot"—had been played out. So this bright comedian found no door open to him. The manager of the Adelphi hazarded the remark, "If Mr. Boucicault will write a new piece for you, I will give you an appearance. He ought to do it, for he told me you were the best eccentric comedian living." So Jefferson came to Boucicault, and they tossed over a dozen subjects. He expressed great affection for "Rip van Winkle," an old and very bad melodrama. He admitted that the piece had failed; he had shown it to Webster, who objected to producing such a rag. Boucicault pointed out that the character of a ragged old sot, however picturesque, was not an attractive object through three acts.

"Stay," cried the author, "a thought occurs to me. Suppose we sweep aside Washington Irving, and make *Rip* a young, buoyant ne'er-do-well, with a young wife and a young child. Let him be the play-fellow of all the children, the lover of all the girls, a village bohemian. Let us carry that character through the first and second acts, and bring him out in the third aged in appearance, but fresh in heart, after his long sleep."

Jefferson was not "enthused" with this new form of the story, but yielded, as he saw no other way to obtain a London appearance. In a few weeks the piece was written, and the Adelphi Theatre was placed at the disposal of Mr. Boucicault. Jefferson's agreement with the manager, Webster, was to share the gross receipts nightly after £70 had been deducted for expenses. The agreement between Boucicault and Jefferson was that the author should receive one-third of Jefferson's share. The play and the comedian made the success of that season. In the summer of the

following year Jefferson went to New York, and there commenced a career too well known and remembered to require record. The share in that success which Boucicault was entitled, under his contract, to receive, he was not destined to enjoy. Jefferson wrote him that no copyright on "Rip" could be sustained in the United States; that it was stolen by several pirates, whom he could not repress. Therefore, in place of a share in his receipts, he would propose to pay a certain amount in lieu of all claims, past or future. And so ended a little golden dream!

* * * * * *

At a dinner party which took place in 1866, the question was discussed as to the value of the literary merit of a play that had recently been produced. One side maintained that the literary element in a drama was rather an impediment than an assistance to popular success.

"Gentlemen," said the host, "will you permit that this question be settled practically? I propose to write three new pieces: one a society drama, relying mainly on its literary treatment; the second a domestic drama, and the third a sensation drama. The pieces shall be produced at the same time, and I guarantee that the success of each shall be in the inverse ratio of its merits."

The proposition was received with roars of laughter. Nevertheless, the three pieces were written. "Hunted Down" was the society drama; "The Long Strike" was the domestic play, and "Flying Scud" the sensation piece. They were produced simultaneously in October, 1866, and the results were precisely what Boucicault had anticipated. This experiment might not be worth recording had not an incident attending the preparation of "Hunted Down" rendered that occasion memorable. The author took the play to Manchester to give it a provincial trial before producing it in London. A company had been engaged, picked out to give each character with greatest effect; but one character, *Rawdon Scudamore*, a fashionable villain, remained uncast. Mr. Calvert, the manager of the Manchester theatre, suggested an unknown, but clever, provincial actor. Boucicault sent for him, was satisfied with his appearance, and engaged Mr. Henry Irving, at a salary of thirty dollars a week, to play the part. The result of this performance was that when "Hunted Down" was produced at the St. James's Theatre, in London, some months later, Boucicault stipulated that Irving should be engaged to create the part.

Life is a chapter of accidents, and the most insignificant and casual frequently become the progenitors of great events.

* * * * * *

In 1874, in pursuance of a contract made with Mr. Lester Wallack, Boucicault had undertaken to compose a new Irish drama, in which he was to appear in the principal character, to be produced in November of that year. The play, entitled "Boyne Water," was in a forward state in September, when Wallack strolled into the author's room in Fifteenth Street to ascertain what scenery would be required. Then for the first time Boucicault laid before him the plot of the new play, and read some of the scenes. As he proceeded, the countenance of the manager fell so miserably that the author paused.

"You don't seem to like the piece," said Boucicault, throwing aside the manuscript.

"Oh yes, that is the difficulty," replied Wallack. "I have just bought the last London success, 'Clancarty.' The part suits me, and it entered into my plans this season to make my appearance in that play, at the conclusion of your engagement next January. This drama of yours involves the same historical characters, especially that of *William the Third*, and the same costumes. You will blanket my piece. You will take the wind out of my sails. What can be done?"

"Nothing that I can see," replied Boucicault, "but to change the period of my play, say, to the present day."

"But you cannot change 'Boyne Water' to another period."

"No," laughed the author. "If we could, it might end differently. No matter, John; leave it to me."

And he did. In a few days an entirely new play was shaped out, in which some of the scenes in "Boyne Water" were used. This was "The Shaughran." The first performance of this drama was a complication of mishaps. When Boucicault arrived at the theatre, two hours before the curtain went up, he was met by his dresser, who asked him what he was going to wear for the part of *Con*. The question suddenly reminded him that he had been so busy with other people that he had forgotten to provide for himself. They mounted into the wardrobe of the theatre.

"Have you got an old red hunting-coat? Where is your *Tony Lumpkin* dress? Surely, you have a Goldfinch coat?"

"But, sir, they will not fit."

"That is just what I want. Tear the arms to make them shorter; slit up the back—so. What have you there? *Tony Lumpkin's* hunting-cap?—black velvet—the very thing! Tear the lining out. I see a splendid pair of old boots yonder."

"Those are not a pair, sir."

"So much the better."

And thus in half an hour the costume of *Con* was patched together. What an escape!

At the end of the second act we had a very fine scene by Matt Morgan—the ruins of St. Bridget's Abbey by moonlight. A bright full moon appeared over the sea, and the silver ripple on the water, admirably contrived by a new process, was depended on to produce a great effect. Just before the scene was discovered, there was "a wait"—something had gone wrong. The gas-man appeared before the author, breathless, perspiring with despair. "Oh, sir, if you please, *the moon has bust!*"—that is, the glass of the apparatus by which the moon was imitated had broken. There was no help for it. The scene must be discovered; and when it was, it exhibited a total eclipse—a big round black hole in the scene represented the luminary; but they had forgotten to shut off the ripple in the water, which continued to sparkle bravely, to the great amusement of the audience, in which *Con* joined heartily.

Surely here were accidents enough, but the worst was to come. In the last scene the villain, *Kinchela*, is shot, and the English officer, examining the body, finds the bullet, entering his heart, has been stopped by a pocket-book he carried in his breast pocket.

"Ah!" cries the *Captain*, "the bullet has entered here; this pocket-book has saved his life."

When Montague approached Arnott and felt for the pocket-book, he could not find it. "Good heavens! Arnott," he exclaimed, "you have forgotten the book."

"No," whispered Arnott, "it is in my tail pocket."

Montague rolled him over and, searching in that region, exclaimed: "Ah! the bullet has entered here; this pocket-book has saved his life."

Not another word of the rest of the play could be heard. Boucicault was so convulsed with laughter that he broke down in the last speech. But good humor never spoiled anything.

DION BOUCICAULT.

THE POETRY OF POVERTY.

BY HENRY BERNARD CARPENTER.

THROUGH such desolate fields, such *campos dolentes*, as those of Poverty, it is no inviting task to go in search of the flowers of poetry. Neither historian nor poet is often found there. Until recently, history has been little more than a tale of battles and treaties, of royal births, deaths, and marriages. To-day the History of the Poor is yet an unwritten chapter of human story. The same might have been said of poetry at the beginning of the last century. For ages Poetry minded high things, and rarely condescended to men of low estate. The heroes of song were not laboring, but fighting, men. Even Rama, the hero of the Hindu epic, is not, strictly speaking, a child of poverty; he is a royal, self-made mendicant. Those white-stoled hermits who figure in the background of the poem, as they glide through the dusk of Indian forests, are not the common poor men of the world. Come nearer to our own West; look along the advancing line of twenty-five hundred years of European song, and even Homer, the Father of Poetry, that high-throned earth-god, with time and the world to wait upon him—even he does not look down to the poor, but up to the rich, to the full-statured "kings of men," to the strong and mighty in battle, to the ancestors of those princes at whose banquet-boards he sat and sang. In the "Odyssey," if poor Laertes is there, it is not because Laertes is a poor man, but because he is the father of the "god-like Odysseus." If Eumæus, the "divine swineherd," is there, it is because among many apostates he remains faithful to a royal master. Open the "Iliad." From beginning to end, the poor unprivileged man vanishes in the driving dust of the chariot wheels, in the roar of contending captains, in the rush and ruin of their spears. The man of the rank and file is scarcely heard, or, if at all, it is always in the briefest possible speech; he is that anonymous character introduced in one or two memorable passages in such words as, "Thus so and so," or "a certain one would speak to his neighbor." Only once is the so-called "friend of the people," the "labor candidate," permitted to make his best bow on the Homeric platform, and then he is no better than a cari-

cature. There he is! poor diminutive Thersites, lame of one foot, bandy-legged, hunch-backed, hollow-chested, his peak-shaped head sprinkled over with a scanty nap of hair,—how he shrieks and spits his ineffectual spite at the princes of Hellas! Such is Homer's "man of the people."

Before we leave Homer, we may look across at him who used to be regarded as his rival. If there be any one who deserves the unloved laurels as a Poet of Poverty, it is Hesiod of Ascra. Like all song which strives to sing itself steadily onward through the flowerless underbrush of penury and toil, his poetry is wanting in beauty. His two great poems, the "Works and Days" and the "Theogony," give us the two sides of a poor countryman's life—the world below, which opens reluctantly to his plough, and the world above, which is shut as remorselessly against his prayer. The first poem is a Poor Richard's Almanack for weekdays; the second, a theological manual for Sundays. The first moves heavily, like the creaking wains and the slow-footed oxen of Hesiod's dear Bœotian plain; the rough, unrhythmic verse is like the noise of mattocks and flails and rakes and harrows. The second, the Greek Book of Genesis, moves more freely and musically, as if it had caught some tones of that grave didactic harp once heard under Helicon. His song is the first and the last under a Hellenic sky which gives a picture of the life of the poor.

From Homer and Hesiod we pass to the triumvirate of the Greek drama—Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides; among the towering forms of their men and women the figures of poverty are scarcely seen. Almost all their characters are kings in purple and fine linen, chieftains in bronze and blood, or gods in mist and flame. These lofty personages, however, begin to recede as Tragedy gives way to Comedy; as Athené herself falls back before her own Athenian farmers whom Aristophanes leads on the stage from the flowery slopes of Acharnæ. That was one step toward the literature of Poverty. For Tragedy lives in the palace; Comedy in the cabin. The Rich never laugh so well as the Poor. It is always those who are stationed at the outposts of wretchedness, those who stare hunger and vicissitude in the face, those who eat their bread with tears on their cheeks and chains on their hands and sickness at heart, to whom God has granted the compensations of laughter. The lower you go in poverty the broader you get in comedy. The slaves in the South, the *Davuses* in Terence,

the *Dromios* in Shakespeare, with old Plautus himself at the head of them, have made most fun for the world. A more pathetic instance of the returning of good for evil there cannot be than the oppressed repaying with smiles the frown of his oppressor. The Irish peasant not only forgives persecution, but makes the heart of his persecutors merry with "inextinguishable laughter."

Besides Comedy, another door of Poetry began to open to Poverty as early as 280 years before the Christian era. O pastoral Theocritus! O chosen voice of the Muses of Sicily! thy mouth drops the sweetness and murmurs the music of thine own Hyblæan honey-bees. In dreamful dells thou reclinest through the golden noon, while the air about thee grows enamored of the chant of thy falling stream and the whisper of thy woodland pine. Still sing to us and to the children of all time; still let thy piping shepherds pour to listening forest-gods the strains given back in soft replies of the Sicilian sea, and in the echoes of those hearts that will love thee forever! Nevertheless, the Idyls of Theocritus do not give us the poetry of the poorer classes. It is, rather, the poetry of summer poverty, of the happy, happy herdsmen of southern Europe. Only when the poet of Sicily leaves the land and embarks on the sea does he catch the real tones of poor men as they talk. His Idyl of the Fishermen is one of the most beautiful pictures and truest pieces of music ever given to the world in the name of poverty. Through the dimness of the night we can hardly see the two figures that couch close together in their ragged hut by the sea-wave, but we overhear their simple, hard-earned philosophy—such philosophy as seafaring men alone can give us.

"All things, yea, all things seemed to those men superfluous; for Poverty was their faithful partner. No neighbor dwelt near them, but on all sides was the sea."

The keynote for all poetry of destitution is struck in the prelude.

"Poverty alone awakens the arts; she it is who is the teacher of toil. For tormenting cares do not allow the laboring man even to sleep. For if he should taste a little of the blessing of the night, yet anxious thoughts haunt him and of a sudden break through his sleep."

This, however, is an exceptional passage in Theocritus, and in this respect Bion and Moschus, the other two members of the idyllic triad, are no better. With all their pastoral sweetness, they turn their backs on the poor and needy; they choose, rather, the mythic, artificial themes, and with chains of gold about their necks, they sit down and sing at the feet of the Ptolemies of Egypt. Vergil, who followed them at an interval of more than two centu-

ries, certainly put a crown of glory unfading on the head of every ploughman and vine-dresser in Italy, when he gave us those four gospels of toil in his "Georgics." How the world-wide sorrow of Man half utters itself in that long-drawn sigh with which he speaks to the toilers of the field! "O too happy husbandmen, did they but know the blessings that are theirs!" The choice of subject, and the tone of plaintive sympathy, deep here as it is elsewhere in his poetry, tell us how clear and true a singer of "the still sad music of humanity" was lost in the author of the "Æneid." That is a touching and beautifully-shaded picture, suddenly introduced in the battle scenery of the Roman epic, where he sketches the poor woman rising between midnight and morning to rekindle the smouldering ashes of the hearth, that she may provide for her little ones and keep her name unblemished in the world. Such a scene makes us wish that Vergil had made way in his "Eclogues" for truer pictures of the poor of his country. But as civilization advances pastoral poetry retires. For when, after slumbering for 1500 years, the poor swains of Vergil wake up and clutch their crooks, and blow again their oaten pipes in Spenser's Cuddies and Colin Clouts, the only shepherds whom we see are a set of grave professors, ponderous prelates, and fat functionaries of state, trying to cover up their corpulence in the threadbare smocks of Daphnis and Corydon, as they frisk and tumble to the tune of Elizabethan politics or Protestant theology.

We leave Spenser and look into that second universe which God created, and man has named William Shakespeare. With Shakespeare, as with his only brother, Homer, the poor too often are the unheroic multitude, unnamed and unknown, or, as he calls them, "the vile many," "the many-headed multitude," or "the vagabond flag upon the stream," which

> "Goes to and back, lackeying the varying tide
> To rot itself with motion."

In his plays the poor, as individuals, rarely rise above insignificance; in groups, they are ludicrous; in masses, contemptible. But is this to be wondered at? As a rule, poetry and poets are in their tendencies aristocratic.

But long before the days of Elizabeth the note of preparation had been sounded. The Redeemer of human life and the Founder of spiritual democracy had said, "Blessed are the Poor." Across the darkness of twelve centuries St. Francis had answered,

"Blessed is Poverty." The word of the saint was echoed across the tumult of five centuries more, and Wesley at Oxford proclaimed, "The Poor shall have the gospel preached unto them." Heaven's two messengers were already on earth, those two sons of thunder, gunpowder and machinery—gunpowder, the great leveller, to bring every Goliath to the level of every David, to put the cavalry below the infantry in the field, to make the weak as mighty as the strong; machinery, to create industries, to call into existence the industrial classes, and to turn the eyes of the earth toward the poor. The Poor needed a religion, and the Lord provided them with Methodism. The Poor needed a poet, and the same Lord provided them with him whom Byron declared to be

"Though Nature's sternest painter, yet the best."

Such a painter is George Crabbe, and as such he reminds one of a certain school of Alexandrian painters once known by the name of Rhyparographers. After Apelles had painted Alexander the Great and passed away, the world grew tired of the lofty classical subjects, of sparkling Helens and of languishing Venuses, and yielding to a common law in matters of fancy and fashion, it began to draw its materials from the opposite side of life. A new school of art arose in Egypt. Earthly and every-day subjects took the place of the old divine ideals. Instead of Mercury putting the sandals on the feet of Venus, it would be a cobbler patching up a pair of brogans. Instead of the unshorn Apollo, it would be a barber mowing down a man's beard. Instead of Neptune's horses or Juno's pearls, it would be "dead sprats and herrings and oyster-shells." The more classical Greeks did not favor these new artists; they named them Rhyparographers—that is, "dirt-painters." George Crabbe is one of these. He paints poor men and women with the mud upon them, and he paints the mud very well. If he turns from Man to visible Nature, he is still rhyparographic. He gives us fine marine pictures, but he is not contented with giving us the sea only; he must give us also the mud at the bottom of the sea. He fairly enjoys painting those long banks of slime left bare by the retiring tide. Like the Anglo-Saxon race, to which he belongs, Crabbe is never very much pained by the unloveliness of the things about him. On the contrary, he takes kindly to the mud of life. But it is wholesome mud; like that now and then uncovered along the coast, it exhales loads of fine moral balm for the breather.

In this respect, though in style the same, yet in matter Crabbe is the very antithesis of Pope. Hence it was said that Crabbe was "Pope in worsted stockings." In him the Poet of Twickenham was come again from the dead. But it was no longer little Pope in his coat of peach-colored satin, with gold-headed cane, shuffling along between quaintly-clipped hedgerows, and in and out of his grottos of glittering stones; it was no longer Pope at the tea-table with exquisite tattlers aud stilted statesmen, among fans and feathered dowagers; but Pope in dingy drab, pacing the pale sands and prosaic shores of Aldborough,—Pope in the poor-house beside the pauper's death-bed, in the court-house beside the outcast woman, in the darkened cottage beside the desolate wife, in the dungeon beside the condemned criminal, on the ship-wrecking shore beside the wail of the new-made widow,—Pope not in the city and the court, but in the country and the cottage; not in the trim, smooth garden, but in the rough, open world.

As the Poet of Poverty, Crabbe achieved his first success in 1783, when he published his "Village." The date is of importance, as it indicates the point where he starts, and also those who followed and those who preceded him in his peculiar line of poetry. In temporal sequence, Cowper, Burns, Wordsworth, all come up behind him. But others had been before him on the paths of poverty. Poetry was glad to follow any one who would take her by the hand and lead her out of the city and the neat suburban gardens into the country with its free grass and unkempt hedges. While Pope and others were epigrammatizing of the city and of riches, Allan Ramsay was singing of the country and of poverty. His "Gentle Shepherd" was followed by Shenstone's "Schoolmistress," Mickle's "Mariner's Wife," Gray's "Elegy," Beattie's "Minstrel," and, last of all, by Langhorne's "Country Justice," which, in its heroic couplets, its choice of subject, its mode of treatment, as well as in point of time, is so near the poetry of Crabbe as to make us feel that the Poet of Aldborough must have come under the influence of its example.

The mention of Crabbe's "Village" may carry back the mind of the reader to Goldsmith's "Deserted Village," in which, thirteen years previously, the poor Irishman had opened a path for the poor Englishman into the field of poverty. There is this great difference, however, between the Irishman's "Village" and the Englishman's, as also between their delineations of the

poor: Goldsmith's is rather the ideal village—the village that has been; Crabbe's is the real village—the village that now is. Over Goldsmith's little commonwealth there is diffused a tender glow, as of the dying day; a pensive, lingering light of sentiment, which tones down the sharp outlines of distress and pain till they grow beautiful in the hues that invest them. No such figures will ever again be produced as Goldsmith's village schoolmaster, his crippled soldier, his compassionate old parish clergyman. But these are ideal figures, such as Crabbe, the realist, would have never drawn. In the treatment of the same or similar characters he seldom enhances his effects by any side-lights or varnish. He takes pains to scour the glass of his pictures so thoroughly that you forget the medium and see only the objects behind. Crabbe is, *par excellence*, the Poet of the Poor; he paints Man, not in his power and lordship over life, but Man in his poverty, in his dependence, his conflict, his privations; in brief, in all those painful conditions—mental, moral, material—created and forced upon him by poverty. If he turns for a moment from Man to Nature, it is to see Nature also in her poverty; never in her glory and joy, in the pomp and prodigality of her life and power. She is always pinched and poor; nearly always sober; at her best, severe. It is not Nature such as she appears to tourists, artists, vision-seers; it is nature such as poor people look at it—a workshop, a cabbage-garden, a grave; never a play-ground or a paradise. Such views may be more painful and less picturesque; yet they lead us more intimately into that life of which Crabbe is the stern and faithful exponent.

Before passing from this writer, a few points may be briefly noted. And first of all, his Realism. Of the two schools of art, which, it is presumed, will always be found side by side, with a reaction perpetually going on between them, Crabbe is certainly not of those who work with special regard to what is beautiful, but of those who pursue their art with exclusive reference to what is true. Excess of truth soon becomes falsehood. Here there is truth to the exclusion of beauty, and therefore we find less than half of life within the sterile, contracted area of what is characteristically the Poetry of Poverty. The climax in art had been reached; the world had seen what men and women might be; the anti-climax was now touched, where people must be seen as they are. The stark, homely, grotesque way of

looking at men and things is pleasing to not a few. It was especially so to a thorough-born son of Saxon Suffolk, such as was George Crabbe. There is a strong local resemblance between his poetry as it grew up on the Suffolk coast and the painting which had already grown up on the shores of Holland, just opposite. Crabbe is a painter of the Dutch school; he gives us what we know as the *genre* picture,—low interiors, smoky rafters, dingy walls, with cracks and stains; plain, heavy-looking men in blue blouses, red night-caps, and hob-nailed shoes; mugs of ale; long clay pipes fuming through their fnddled fingers; the high lights on their bull-dog foreheads, and their thick, polished red noses; a fat, culinary sort of woman in the background, and very unimaginative children looking in at the door. Such are Crabbe's pictures, if we only leave out of them all the broad mirth and farcical fun which poverty often brings along with her as one of her best compensations, when she makes us laugh or be laughed at. But what fun is there in a Parish Register? This, however, our poet takes, photographs the men and women therein, describes how they look and what they feel as they stand at the font, before the altar, round the grave. So realistic is he that, as you read him, it sounds like the *Police News* turned into poetry, or the "City Directory" put into heroic couplets.

George Crabbe is also, and that in a preëminent degree, a Poet of Tragedy. Out of pure sympathy with suffering, he prefers to look at life from its darker, more tragic side. Like Milton, like Young, like Wordsworth, he seldom laughs. Sparing in his comic touches, he is often powerful in his tragic strokes. With evil he deals in all his pictures—evil as it presses so sharply on the life of the poor. But how different is his treatment of it from many preceding writers. Swift snarls at it, Pope sneers, Johnson scolds. Chaucer rather laughs at evil, and then lets it go. Crabbe approaches evil seriously, even sadly; examines, condemns, but seldom lets it go without a sentence of pity and pardon. At any rate, he never leaves the picture on which he is engaged till he has made you feel that conscience has fought her way back to her throne through the civil war of the passions; the penalty has been inflicted, the spirit repents, justice is satisfied, and, as the curtain drops, the disordered balance of life is restored.

With Man in those situations of pain and poverty in which Crabbe prefers to place him, no background could be more in

keeping than those silver-grays and that pale wintry sunlight spread over all his landscapes. This pictorial effect is best given in a couplet of his own. "With mingled tints"—for Crabbe does not make use of colors, but rather tints, just as his characters seem never to laugh, but only to smile—

> "*With mingled tints* the rocky coasts abound,
> And a *sad splendour vainly shines* around."

And yet, as on a day of thick mist in the country the presence of the chill, cheerless vapor serves, as may be often noted, to bring out more vividly than in sunshine all the objects near the ground,—the bright green of the wayside ferns, the scarlets and yellows of the flowers, the tints of the rock in all their sharpness and clearness,—so this very sadness of atmosphere in the poetry of Crabbe seems to aid him in his observation of smaller and lowlier things.

As a Marine Painter, Crabbe is among the first. Some poets there are who have made the sea their own. Byron and Shelley sing of the sea as yachtsmen; Swinburne, as a swimmer; Allan Cunningham, as a first-mate; Falconer, as a shipwrecked sailor;—but Crabbe, as a dweller beside its waters, as a watcher of its wonder, as a lover of all its terror and its mystery. He knows "the unwieldy porpoise" as it "rolls in view"; the distant petrel that swims with her brood through the troubled spray; the wild ducks that glide in their wedge-like figures, in level line, from the north; the sea-gulls that drop for prey into the surge, face round with rallying cry against the blast,

> "Or clap the sleek white pinion to the breast,
> And in the *restless* ocean dip for *rest*."

Thus viewed as a Painter of Man and of Nature, Crabbe, in his relation to those who preceded and those who followed him, is preëminently the Poet of the Poor. In Burns, the joy of existence and the sympathy with nature, together with all the colors and sounds of this ever-varying world, help to mitigate the rigorous severity of that life which enters with its sharp edge into the soul of poverty-stricken man. In Wordsworth, the poor men are too often philosophers in shirt sleeves. Wordsworth's hero, a preaching peddler, is Wordsworth himself. Such poems as Tennyson's "Dora" and "Enoch Arden," Hood's "Song of the Shirt," Elizabeth Browning's "Cry of the Children," Longfellow's "Evangeline," Whittier's "Mabel Martin," are the exceptions rather than the rule, such as we find it in Crabbe. If too much of a good

thing is objectionable, too much of an evil thing is to be condemned. One such song as Trowbridge's "Vagabonds" ("Roger and I") is enough. Once done, and in so masterly a style, we should soon become nauseated if we found two such tramps extended to eight volumes of them, as in the collected works of George Crabbe. Carleton, in his "Farm Ballads," and Robert Dinsmoor, still truer to poverty, will always be welcomed as interpreters of country life in America. But, as a rule, the New England farmer and his agricultural brethren in the United States are altogether too comfortable to be included in that class of sufferers which is embraced in the literature of destitution.

William Barnes, the Dorsetshire poet—the Burns of South Britain (if ever there could be a second Burns)—claims far more than this merely passing reference, holding, as he does, the first rank among the poets of rural life. Poverty, however, as such, is not the chosen theme of his song, as it is from beginning to end in the verse of Crabbe. To Crabbe, therefore, we concede the wreath never won by any singer of Greek, of Roman, or of English song—that wreath for which he wrought—that wreath which he so justly made his own. No laurelled garland it is, but a crown of thorns. Such as it is, let him wear it; while to his eternal praise be it said, and to the praise of those who, before and after him, touched on these themes of penury and mortal pain, that it was the Poetry of Poverty, born in the eighteenth century, which built the bridge across the widening chasm between the rich and the poor in England. In France, now just a century ago, no such literature had arisen, which by its timely intervention might have softened, then brought nearer, and at last cemented the sundered strata of society. On the English side of the Channel, when the shock of revolution did come, if it was not followed by a social rupture so terrible and so permanent as in France, the causes are to be sought in the character and institutions of the people of the British Isles, and, in no small degree, in the influence then exerted by their literature. In such an influence not the least powerful element was the form which poetry had just assumed, and foremost among those who had been softening the antipathies of the classes so often on the verge of civil war was he who was contented to wear the lowliest laurels in behalf of the lowliest of men and women,—George Crabbe, the Poet of the Poor.

HENRY BERNARD CARPENTER.

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

LONDON, June 21, 1889.

MY DEAR SIR:

I accede without hesitation to your request that I would put on paper my recollections of Mr. Thorndike Rice, whose sudden death we all so much regret. For though I am not sure that I ever had the advantage of conversing with Mr. Rice but once (our limited intercourse having been principally conducted by letter), I received on seeing him a very definite impression as to his possession of the particular gift which it was the professional purpose of his life to apply and develope.

The character of Editor, as such, is comparatively modern. It meets a manifest want of modern society; and the duty of the Editor is to select and compound for a very large portion of modern communities a main part of their staple mental food. I at once perceived, or seemed to myself to perceive, that Mr. Rice possessed, in a very remarkable degree, the gifts required for the effective discharge of the function of an Editor. Your countrymen will have had larger means of forming an opinion, and will have formed one far weightier than mine.

In another point of view, I view the career of Mr. Rice with interest and respect. Mr. Rice was, as I understand, a man of independent fortune; and, being such, he nevertheless gave himself to a laborious occupation. The growth of a class of idle rich men would, in my opinion, be a great misfortune to America, as it must be to any other country, and I take it as a sign of a mind aspiring to public virtue when the rich man frankly and practically owns himself to be amenable to the common lot of honourable duty and labour.

I remain, my dear sir,
Faithfully yours,
W. E. GLADSTONE.

TO THE HON. LLOYD BRYCE.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I

OUR STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE.

FROM time immemorial it has been the custom to regard disease as a necessary concomitant of life. Many reasons have been suggested for its existence, even to the hypothesis that disease is the normal state of man, and health but an exceptional or abnormal state. But, aside from theories of this sort, we have much new and positive knowledge respecting the nature of diseases. And while it may be premature as yet to speak of all diseases as belonging to one class, yet the number of them that may be placed under a single head is so great that the public should realize what an enormous addition to our knowledge has been made through biological research.

To put it popularly, what is called disease is no longer a mysterious entity, nor are its causes usually obscure. In great part it seems to be a struggle for existence between ourselves and certain lower forms of life. Were it not for these attacking hosts, it is not at all improbable that man could easily resist injuries (unless vital organs were mechanically crippled), changes of temperature, humidity, pressure, etc., and live a life of greatly increased duration, in which physical discomfort, except from accident, should be almost unknown.

What is the nature of these attacking hosts which constitute disease? We know that the seeds of many plants float about in the air, and that when they fall on suitable soil and are exposed to favorable conditions of moisture, temperature, light, etc., they germinate and grow at the expense of the air and the soil. The plant sends out its leaves and breathes the air, taking in such nutriment as its organism requires, while its roots pierce downwards in search of the nutriment that is in the soil. Every one who observes at all knows all this. He sees the floating seed of the dandelion, the whirligigs of the maple, and he wearily picks off the clinging burr which is trying to make him its carrier. He knows that rich soil, moisture, fresh air, and sunlight are necessary to luxuriant plant-life. He knows more. He knows that a solution of sugar, such as a fruit-juice, if exposed to the air, soon goes into fermentation and passes from a sweet liquid into one that is alcoholic and intoxicating. He also knows that this is no new phenomenon, for the patriarch Noah proved by the most convincing experience that it was a well-known fact even in his day.

The man of the present day who has had any kind of scientific education knows that this fermentation of sugar is caused by the growth in the sugar of a minute plant, called the yeast-plant, the spores, or seeds, of which are omnipresent in the atmosphere of the temperate and tropic zones. These little seeds fall into a sugar solution that is exposed to the air and grow with great energy. Sugar is the particular food of the yeast-plant, and the carbonic acid and alcohol which are formed from the sugar during its growth are the products of its life. If we sow a rich field with corn, we get an exuberant growth of the corn-plant. If we sow the seeds of yeast in a liquid containing sugar, we get a luxuriant growth of the yeast-plant. It is a good thing to make two blades of grass grow where one had struggled up before, and the change of the saccharine juice of fruit into wine is as well known to the careful housewife of to-day, who makes her blackberry wine to gladden the heart of her husband, as it was to St. Paul, who so emphatically indorsed the dietetic action of the yeast-plant's product.

So far the biologist and the public go easily together, but at this point the broad and well-beaten road ends, and a difficult path, beset with many obstacles, leads onward. On this the trained senses of the biologist carry him with ease through vast domains that are almost unknown to the unskilled man, and in which the latter soon loses himself, since he knows not the landmarks and has not a compass wherewith to guide his steps aright.

To speak again popularly,—for this is not the place to go into the minuter details of biological science,—there are certain microscopic seeds, or spores, that grow best in an albuminous soil, and the organisms resulting from them alter, decompose, or assimilate the albuminous matters in which they grow or on which they thrive. These seeds—I use the word in its broadest and most popular sense—are found widely disseminated in nature, some in the air, some in water, and others in the soil and in our food. So universally are these minute germs distributed that it is difficult to find any object which has been exposed to air or water that does not contain more or fewer of them. The liquids and organic solids of our bodies are largely composed of substances that afford these seeds their most suitable nutriment, and our bodily warmth makes the conditions necessary for their growth most favorable. Suppose one gets a deep wound. On this fresh, raw surface rain the myriads of germs floating in the air, or they are communicated by the fingers that touch the wound, or the garments that adhere to it. Among these multitudinous seeds are some that find the conditions of nutriment, moisture, and temperature most favorable to their development, and in a short time they reproduce, reaching numbers almost beyond the power of the imagination to grasp. In consequence of this the wound does not heal; it runs, becomes foul, blood-poisoning sets in, and the man dies. In other cases, the wound heals and the man recovers.

Let us examine this again in a popular way. When the freshly-exposed surface is attacked by the invading seeds, it does not rest quietly, as does the soil when the plant seed is placed in it, but countless minute organisms, which exist in and are produced by the human mechanism, attack the foreign germs and destroy them, and so prevent their growth and reproduction. Should this protecting army conquer, the invading host is destroyed and the wound heals. Should the invaders get the upper hand, then the protecting army is disorganized and overcome, and the flesh or organ, instead of remaining a part of a delicately-adjusted mechanism, becomes mere food for the foreign life. These foreign organisms do not, like the yeast-plant, eliminate carbonic acid and alcohol, but many of them produce terrible poisons, which, mixing with the blood, are carried to the vital centres, and so the man dies from poisoning as well as from a disabled organ.

Multitudes of these disease-germs exist. Some grow in raw flesh; some are breathed in with the air and take up their abode in the lungs, as, for instance, in the case of consumption; some show a preference for certain parts of the intestinal tract, as in typhoid fever and cholera. Others attack the liver, and others, again, thrive best in some of the glands and on the mucous membranes, as in the case of diphtheria. The rapidity of reproduction of these lower forms of life almost surpasses belief. The *bacterium termo* (fortunately not a disease-germ) is a minute rod, which reproduces itself by breaking in two. Each half then grows larger and again breaks in two. This process goes on very quickly. Indeed, if its reproduction were unrestricted, a single *bacterium termo* would in a short time fill a space as large as that occupied by the Atlantic Ocean.

Fortunately for us, while the disease-germs are numerous enough about us, we are provided with many means of resisting their onslaught. If, for example, they get into the blood, the white corpuscles of the blood attack and eat them up. But the balance is at best a delicate one, and it takes but little to turn it against us. There are many of these disease-germs, however, that are not easily resisted. If they find their way into our organism by inoculation, through a scratch or cut, for instance, they are invariably more or less successful in establishing a foothold within us, in which case we must succumb. We cannot be food for other organisms and at the same time live for ourselves.

In the laboratory of the biologist may be seen little phials in which are contained

the seeds of diseases. By the prick of a needle an animal may be inoculated with the specific disease that is named on the label of the phial, as with hydrophobia, diphtheria, or scarlet fever. This can be done with as much certainty as the farmer would sow the seeds of corn, rye, or wheat, knowing that he would get crops according to the sowing.

The majority of diseases, it now appears, are thus explicable. All the fevers and the contagious diseases, and many of the constitutional infections, are probably to be traced to the parasitic development which I have described. These diseases are results of a struggle for existence between man and minute forms of life. If these foreign organisms, the so-called saprophytes, gain a foothold, and the conditions continue favorable to their development, the man suffers or dies.

We are not considering the ethics of the subject. We shall not discuss which has the better right to survive, the saprophyte or the man. It is possible that in the vast scheme of the Cosmos, such a small portion of which we comprehend, good and sufficient reason may exist for the victory of the saprophyte. But from our standpoint we must regard our own existence as the more important. Man must consider as inimical to himself every object and every influence that tend to shorten, endanger, or injure his life, or impair his happiness. We are at war with myriads of lower organisms which are trying to live on us, and which by so doing injure, cripple, or kill us. Wars are children's games compared to these silent, invisible, deadly enemies which are ever about us, waiting for an unprotected spot on which to attack us. They have neither conscience nor feeling. They are the seeds of death. They respect neither sex, station, nor age. Their existence means misery, agony, and death to the human race. The issue is fairly before us. Let no man slight it or undervalue its magnitude. These enemies cannot be laughed or reasoned away. We cannot escape them. The most important question to-day is, How can we protect ourselves against the saprophyte?

PETER T. AUSTEN.

II.

RAPID TRANSIT IN CITIES.

THE PROBLEM of the rapid transportation of travellers within its own limits has not yet been satisfactorily solved by any of the large cities of Europe or America. As for travel upon regular lines of railway from city to city, probably very nearly the ultimate possibility of human accomplishment has been reached in the "Flying Scotchman," the "Flying Irishman," and the "Chicago Limited." At all events, it is difficult to see how much greater speed can be attained on rails of steel or iron within the reasonable limits of safety, even if we admit that electricity or some other substitute for steam (Mr. Keely's "motor," for instance) may be made available in the future. In intra-urban transit, however, much less marked progress has been made. The horse- or tram-car slowly displaced the omnibus or stage; and up to the present time this has been our chief reliance. Elevated and underground railways are scarcely more than a dozen years old, and their use thus far has been extremely limited. Such means of travel as are afforded by the underground railways of London and the elevated railroads of New York are as great an improvement upon the lumbering horse-car as an ordinary "way" train on our railroads is an advance upon the stage-coach of the olden time; and no greater. For travel in cities there has not yet been provided the correspondent of the railway "express" train. Until that is furnished, the problem stated in my opening sentence will not approach solution.

Ten years' experience has shown conclusively that the elevated-railway system of New York cannot furnish *rapid* transit. It has also shown beyond dispute that this is but a single step in the unfolding of the rapid-transit question. Already the elevated cars are as distressingly overcrowded as the horse-cars were twelve or fifteen years ago. Competent observers affirm that the underground roads of London have done no more for that city than the elevated roads have done for New York, even if they have done as much. Doubtless nine out of ten unprejudiced men who have travelled on both systems would unhesitatingly say that the elevated is preferable to the underground on account of light and ventilation, and at least its

equal in speed. The London roads are dark, smoky, badly lighted, without any pretence of furnishing fresh air, and, on the whole, about as uncomfortable as they well could be. This is the common verdict; and it has recently been confirmed by the careful observations of a man who has spent no little time and money in the endeavor to give the American metropolis adequate means of rapid transit.

In several of the smaller of our cities surface cars propelled by cables or some form of electric traction are in use; but these are incapable of attaining more than very moderate rates of speed. Six miles an hour is, I believe, about the average. That is clearly out of the question in discussing *rapid* transit, although there is no doubt that the cable or the electric motor is vastly to be preferred to horses as a means of propulsion. On the score of cleanliness alone the use of either of the two is to be advocated, even at a slight advance in cost. Merely by reason of decreased expense in street-cleaning, any city could well afford to make it worth while for its street-car companies to make the substitution.

The subject in hand, as related to the chief American city, is both easier and more difficult to be disposed of than when applied to most other cities. Manhattan Island being long and narrow, the question there is to carry a great multitude of people in one direction in the morning hours, and just as many in the opposite direction in the evening. In towns where there are numerous lines of travel radiating from a common centre, the conditions are in one way simplified. More rapid-transit roads are needed in this case, to be sure, but smaller carrying capacity is required. In New York arrangements must be made for transporting an immense number of passengers over a limited number of lines running north and south. I propose to consider the problem in connection with New York: the modifications needed to make the conclusions applicable to other cities will readily suggest themselves.

It is indispensable to provide for "through" and "way" trains, or for express and local travel. Hence four tracks will be required—two to be used for each sort of business. The road or roads should be so constructed as to permit express trains to be run at high rates of speed—forty miles an hour, if necessary. Such trains ought not to stop at shorter intervals than a mile; they would be used by long-distance passengers, or by people going to regular railway stations on the upper part of the island for the purpose of leaving the city. For suburban residents special "through" trains, or at least "through" cars, should be provided. The stations for local or "way" trains should be placed not further than a quarter or a third of a mile apart, and passengers should be permitted to pass freely from one class of trains to the other. These are the principal conditions to be met in any system that is brought forward before favorable consideration can be granted to it. The various methods proposed from time to time may be classified, in a general way, as falling under one or another of five groups. These I shall take up consecutively. It will be seen that three of them (perhaps four) are modifications of one cardinal idea.

First in order comes the "Arcade" system. The promoters of this propose to make an open cut along Broadway, which shall afterward be bridged over, and the present surface of the street practically restored. Within this cut, and just underneath the surface, the railway tracks are to be placed. The objections to this scheme are numerous. During the process of construction the city's principal street would be virtually closed against business. Sewers, gas-pipes and water-pipes would be seriously disturbed, and a rearrangement of them would be rendered necessary. Then there is grave doubt as to the effect of the excavation on the foundations of buildings in Broadway, and their owners would not consent to the work unless an adequate guarantee against damage were given. The damages might run up to untold millions, and capitalists would hesitate to assume such a risk. The plan is a practicable one, but there is extreme doubt whether it will ever be carried into execution.

A tunnel beneath a street, excavated at a sufficient depth not to interfere with traffic on the surface, is open to many of the same objections. The network of subterranean pipes would be an obstacle of no small dimensions, and, as with the "Arcade" plan, vaults would be invaded and foundations might be undermined. Of course, if the city itself should go into the business of constructing a rapid-transit system, as was proposed not long ago by a high authority, these obstacles would not be

found insuperable. On the general subject of tunnels it is well to say that the features of those in London which render them so objectionable may be obviated without great trouble. Especially will this be the case when the electric motor is brought into successful use. A limitless supply of pure air can readily be made certain, and even with steam locomotives there can be freedom from smoke. Now that cars can be supplied with electric lights, there is no reason why travel on underground roads may not be made comfortable.

A tunnel scheme that has met with considerable favor is one that proposes to run through the blocks, the company buying the right of way outright, and, after its work is completed, constructing such buildings on its property as it may deem best. The tunnel would comprise the cellars or basements of these buildings, and there could be no charge that private rights had been invaded. The privilege of crossing streets would have to be obtained from the authorities, and only at crossings would the tangle of "all sorts and conditions" of pipes cause annoyance. While the work of construction was in progress there need be little interference with public travel, as one crossing could be completed before permission was given to open another.

Perhaps the most attractive tunnel project is that which gets rid of all difficulties and obstacles growing out of work near the surface by the heroic remedy of making the excavation at a depth of 100 or 150 feet. A tunnel there would be blasted through solid rock—the "bed-rock" of the island—and the depth would be sufficient to prevent any disturbance at the surface during the progress of the work. Such an undertaking would be enormous in magnitude, but it presents no engineering difficulties that could not readily be overcome. Naturally, a matter of much interest would be the raising and lowering of passengers. With an abundant supply of huge elevators this could easily be accomplished, however; and it has even been suggested that the cars themselves might be placed on "lifts," and, when the passengers had taken their seats, quickly lowered to the tunnel and started on their way. One peculiar advantage of this plan for Manhattan Island is that subsidiary tunnels could be excavated from the southern end of New York to both the New Jersey and Long Island shores, thus bringing the city into immediate connection with the great railroad systems around it. On such a road-bed as would be provided, should this scheme be carried out, the highest speed would be practicable for express trains.

One other plan remains to be mentioned—a plan in many respects superior to any of those already passed in review. This is an elevated road built through the middle of blocks on ground purchased and owned by the company. But not an elevated road supported on stilts, like those that disfigure so many of New York's streets. Such structures can hardly be considered as more than temporary makeshifts. No serious accident has yet occurred on these roads, but there have been several "hairbreadth 'scapes," and many people have a firm belief that a horrible disaster is bound to happen sooner or later. Be that as it may, these elongated bridges must be renewed throughout from time to time, and I have little doubt that in a not very remote future they will be condemned and cast aside. The elevated structure through the middle of blocks will be a far different affair. It will be either a solid viaduct of masonry from end to end, or else a substantial earthwork with bridges at the street crossings. On this there could be reasonably rapid travel. Passengers would have the privilege of moving in the upper light and air, and the marring of the streets by unsightly structures would be reduced to a minimum. The railways that enter London on viaducts furnish a good model of what such a road would be.

In connection with each of these plans the element of cost is a consideration of the first magnitude. To estimate the expense in advance is not easy. But I think experience justifies the assertion that either of these projects, carried out on a handsome scale, would be a paying investment. It is a fairly well-established law that the greater the facilities for carrying people the greater will be the number of people to be carried. Take a single illustration. The horse-cars of New York have as many passengers now as they had a dozen years ago, in spite of the enormous crowds transported by the elevated roads. So it is within bounds to affirm that the capitalists who are far-seeing enough to put their money into a properly-constructed tunnel,

or a substantial elevated railroad through the middle of blocks, will be sure of an ample return in a few years at the furthest. Their advent is impatiently awaited.

ARCHIE EMERSON PALMER.

III.

CONSTITUTIONAL PATCHWORK.

RECENT attempts in several States so to amend the constitution as to incorporate a provision prohibiting the manufacture and sale of spirituous or intoxicating beverages render it a timely subject of inquiry whether such provisions are germane to the true purpose, object, and meaning of a fundamental framework of government.

They ought not to be so regarded. The sole and legitimate aim of a constitution is to declare those universal and well-recognized fundamental principles of equality, justice, freedom, and right which have been demonstrated in the experience of mankind and received the common consent. Any asserted rule or principle which has not obtained such support is of too doubtful a character to be classed among fundamental doctrines, and ought not to have the advantage of constitutional sanction. Once lowered to admit principles which belong to statutory provisions, and which are the outgrowth of temporary excitement or passing whim in the changeful popular opinion, government would soon lose all its permanency of character and efficiency in administration. Besides, until any avowed doctrine of government has so commended itself to the conservative reflection of a community as to achieve practical support and lodgment, it has little hope of accomplishing the result desired. As long as any statutory treatment of an offence has a public sentiment to sustain it, it will not need the strength of constitutional provision; when it ceases to possess the public support, it will not help its enforcement to have it embodied in the constitution. Nothing is gained by a constitutional declaration in behalf of a doubtful proposition: it neither convinces the popular mind nor strengthens the popular conscience. If it has to be put in the organic law to save it from fluctuations in the drift of popular opinion, it is hardly worth salvation; if it is in no danger therefrom, to embody it in the statute enactment is sufficient for its entire purpose, and gives it all the dignity and sanctity it requires.

The truth of the matter is that the same opinion which is needed to create a legislative machinery for the enforcement of a constitutional provision is all that is demanded to enact and enforce such a legal principle without marring the organic law. In other words, a legislature fresh from the people, and subject to the popular sentiment, which would provide means to enforce a constitutional amendment prohibiting any offence, would enact as strong statutory provisions to accomplish the same purpose; and a legislature which, reflecting a reverse popular sentiment, would decline or refuse to pass restrictive laws in relation to any subject, would be quite as indifferent to constitutional provisions looking in that direction. You may say that with a constitutional prohibition they are rendered powerless to sanction it by any permissive legislation. True; but the only result would be an illegal occupation permitted to continue by tacit consent. You may urge, further, that such a prohibition would place the legislature under constitutional obligation to enact the "proper restrictive legislation." True; but very little is accomplished in attempting to legislate against a recognized public opinion, at least in relation to social customs and habits.

But the gravest objection to such constitutional patchwork is its tendency to lower and belittle the dignity and character of our organic law. The repose of society is of no small value, and permanence in fundamental principles is essential to the stability of our institutions and the peace and good order of society.

The more the individual can be left to govern himself, the safer and better for the community. Educate the public mind, instruct the public conscience, direct the public thought and moral sense aright, and little law is needed to preserve the public welfare. Enact what statutes you please, make them rigid as you please, annex what penalties you please in advance of the popular sentiment, and it will only eventuate in reducing the respect for all law, in lax execution or non-enforcement, and finally

in official corruption and general demoralization. Such has been the universal experience. A healthy public sentiment must precede any extreme change of law, to have it effective or permanent. Without it no law is of much value.

One of the evil fruits of free institutions, admitting all to participation in the work of government, is the opportunity it affords for airing all sorts of crude theories and attempting ill-considered experiments. Hence the agitator, especially if he is possessed of means which he is willing to devote to political purposes, exercises a power pernicious and often dangerous. With a single idea and ample fortune, stimulated generally by fondness for notoriety, he compels a partial or complete subserviency to his whim by threats of political punishment. Political parties too often, anxious for his favor or timid at his threat, accept his proffered assistance, and henceforth submit to his unreasonable exactions rather than court defeat because of his senseless displeasure. He is never satisfied with results. Gaining only a half-loaf will enrage him more than loss of the whole. Belonging to no party, save to desert or betray in the hour of supreme need, he is justly hated by all. Sooner or later cause or candidate grieves his political chastity and forces him to new alliances. Following his own logic, with a conceit that admits of no doubt; impatient of every suggestion he does not originate and every movement he does not pioneer; indifferent alike to praise or blame so long as he is the subject of public comment; revengeful toward opponents and distrustful of friends, he has thus far, happily, not multiplied largely in our political activities. If he were not so much voice, but were more hands, he would do greater harm. Of late he has turned his energy toward reform by constitutional amendment, and in quite a number of States has, with varying success, attempted to promote constitutional prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages. Later it will be something else—Utopian and attractive, no doubt.

In view of these threatened assaults upon our organic law, it becomes us to consider well the question involved. That the highest result aimed at cannot be thus obtained has been successfully demonstrated. But were it otherwise, were it possible to secure it in no other way at present than by a violation (as it seems to me) of fundamental principle, I would prefer to wait for riper and truer methods to come, perhaps, in the fulness of time or the maturer wisdom of a later age. Some sacrifices are too great for the results they purchase; and to gain, by cheapening a constitutional framework of government, what can more easily be accomplished by statute provisions would be a significant and striking instance.

Nor is it a question of the home against the saloon, as some would make us believe. We do not need to confound means to a result with the result itself. Those who claim that constitutional prohibition is the only method of successfully shielding the community from the curse of dram-drinking beg the real question at issue, and so reason in the hope of playing on the moral sense or timidity of good people who abhor the liquor traffic and its terrible results. I am attempting no justification of either, although I do not accept all these declaimers urge even in that behalf. I am only addressing attention to the simple evil of constitutional methods in dealing with a subject which requires only statute law for its suppression. My claim is that all that can be accomplished by any method looking to the restriction or abrogation of the liquor traffic or any similar evil, closely interwoven, as it has become, with the social life and daily habits of our cosmopolitan society, can be as well, fully, and efficiently reached by statute law as by any other means; and that it is entirely foreign to our framework of government—to that collection of axiomatic political doctrines termed the organic law, to its aim, purpose, and meaning—to engraft upon it mere police regulations and subjects of statute restriction. Nor is it an answer to assert that prohibition of any practice pernicious to the welfare of the community prohibits, while license fails to accomplish so beneficial or salutary a result. Prohibition can come quite as powerfully armed from the statute as from the constitution; each requires the same machinery for its enforcement—the same powers to be exercised, and the same official, diligent fidelity to exercise them. Strong provisions and honest officers are needed in both cases. Without a healthy public opinion in their support, demanding the rigid law and its strict enforcement, the play when

played to the end will only prove a mournful farce. If it come in the form of a statute, its repeal will be alone in answer to public sentiment, and will be easily and speedily accomplished, leaving little or no friction to irritate the public mind. If it be dignified into a constitutional provision, it can only be eradicated, even in response to the most earnest popular protest, by a lengthy and cumbersome process, leaving in its trail a violated constitution and a corresponding enfeebling of that just regard in which such solemn instruments have been held. The effect in the one case would be temporary and slight; in the the other permanent and harmful.

CHARLES J. NOYES,
Ex-Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives.

IV.

THE ADVANTAGES OF DEBT.

AMONG the threadbare themes of moralists, one of the most hackneyed is the misery of being in debt. Ever since the days of Addison and the *Spectator* this has been a favorite and prolific topic of periodical essayists and writers on "Self-Help"; and if it be true of human afflictions that "they can paint them best who feel them most," we cannot doubt the ability of these writers to present the matter in the most vivid colors. "I am astonished," says Sir Richard Steele, whose whole life was a race with bailiffs and catchpolls, and who excused himself for voting in flagrant contradiction to his professed principles by saying to one who reproached him, "Mr. Whiston, you can walk on foot, but I cannot,"—"I am astonished that men can be so insensible to the danger of running into debt. One would think it impossible that a man who is given to contracting debts should not know that his creditor has, from that moment in which he transgresses payment, so much as that demand comes to, in his debtor's honor, liberty, and fortune." "Out of debt," echoes Douglas Jerrold, with the passionate eloquence of one tasting for the first time the luxury he describes, "and though you have a patch on your knee, a hole in your hat, and a crack in your shoe-leather, you are still the son of liberty, free as the singing lark above you. Out of debt, and what a nourishing sweetness may be found in cold water; what toothsomeness in a dry crust; what ambrosial nourishment in a hard egg! . . . The debtor, what is he but a serf, out upon a holiday—a slave, to be reclaimed at any instant by his owner, the creditor?"

This, it must be confessed, is well put, and by writers who are entitled to say, *Experto crede*. But there is another side to the subject, and it is easy to show that, if debt has its miseries, it has, by the never-failing law of compensation, its blessings too, which equal, if they do not more than counterbalance, them. If the condition of indebtedness is one of slavery, the long and splendid roll of men who have bowed to its yoke shows that it has a strange fascination. Lord Bacon wrote on "The Wisdom of Business," yet ran desperately in debt. William Pitt had an income of thirty to fifty thousand dollars a year, and died two hundred thousand dollars in debt. Sheridan spent the fortunes of two wives, and was always dodging creditors and bailiffs. Daniel Webster had a large professional income, yet lived and died amid a swarm of debts. Was not Fielding swamped all his life by debt, and yet did not Lady Montague say of him "that he had known more happy moments than any person on earth"?

But, not to rely on great names, who does not love to be "an object of interest" to his fellow-men? and what surer or easier way of becoming such than by contracting "little bills" and large in all quarters? Who is the object of more watchful attention, of tenderer and more anxious solicitude, on the part of his fellow-citizens, than he whose promises to pay are held year after year? Whose movements are watched more closely, whose health is inquired after with more trembling solicitude, whose death is mourned over with more poignant sorrow than his who owes many thousands more than his estate can pay? There is no man who does not love to hold *some* place in the memories of his fellow-men who does not cling to the pleasing hope that he will not become entirely "to dumb forgetfulness a prey" when he shall have shuffled off his mortal coil; and how can one more effectually guard against so

painful a result than by leaving in the hands of his friends and neighbors, not a worthless lock of hair, but a more precious memorial in the shape of an unsettled bill or note-of-hand, the *interest* of which will be forever increasing? The memory of such a man will be cherished with the keenest interest; while he who is scrupulous to "pay as he goes" is doomed to hopeless obscurity while he lives, and, when he dies, is forgotten or thought of without a pang of regret. "We are not *great* people at all," said Sydney Smith when he went into a new neighborhood, and it was given out in the local papers that he was a man of high connections; "we are only *common* honest people—people that pay our debts." How vivid were Horace Greeley's recollections of poor Poe, whose autograph he held on several bits of paper, compared with his memory of other and even greater poets!

There is another advantage of debt of even greater moment; it gives a zest to life which nothing else can impart. The man in debt is never tormented with that uneasy listlessness, that restless craving without an object, that mobility without an aim, that feeling of idleness, yet of disquiet, which is known as *ennui*. Of that wretched feeling which led Spinoza to pass his time in catching spiders and teaching them to fight, and which drove the master spirit of antiquity, the Stagirite himself, when his wine of life had run to the lees, to die as the fool dieth, by his own hands, the debtor knows nothing. The fire of existence never with him becomes caky or ashy; his soul never prays upon itself; he experiences none of the miseries that steal in upon him whose life is free from anxiety or care. With the debtor life is full of meaning and interest. He has a continual spur to exertion, and the pleasure of faculties kept perpetually on the stretch. While the minds of other men are drooping like a banner by a flag-staff for want of the wind of occasion to set them in motion, his is incessantly occupied with schemes to silence the importunate demands of creditors and to keep sheriffs from his door. Whether scouring the streets to borrow money or busied with schemes for earning it, he is thoroughly engrossed in the passing day, and has not a moment for the torture of excessive ease. Of the "blue devils" he knows nothing; he has never to contrive expedients for killing time, nor does he ever think of hanging himself, as many a debt-free rich man has done, lest he should one day come to want. Occupied continually with the care of meeting or dodging obligations that are falling due, his "quick thoughts like lightning are alive"; all his hours are filled with excitement and action; and if, as the author of "Festus" says, "he whose heart beats quickest lives the longest," then assuredly does the debtor

> "Live in one hour more than in years do some
> Whose fat blood sleeps as it slips along their veins."

WILLIAM MATHEWS.

SOUTH END

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXCIV.

SEPTEMBER, 1889.

THE ELIXIR OF LIFE.

BY WILLIAM A. HAMMOND, SURGEON-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED.

THE search for elixirs of life is only one phase of that insatiable desire to investigate the infinite which has characterized the human species since it first made its appearance on the earth. The philosopher's stone, the fountain of youth, the squaring of the circle, perpetual motion, are other forms to which mankind have at different periods of the world's history given much time and thought. Some of these are, in the very nature of things, impossibilities, and not long ago the French Academy refused to receive any communications from those who pretended that they had discovered perpetual motion. But others are by no means impossibilities, and those who declare that they are have no clear idea of the matter at issue. The philosopher's stone, for instance, or something analogous thereto, which a few hundred years ago was the object of much scientific research, is probably by no means beyond the realm of realization. By the use of this agent it was supposed that the baser metals could be transmuted into gold. Subsequently, when science had made considerable progress, such a pretension was regarded as absolutely absurd, but recent advances in chemistry and physics have shown

us that many substances which were formerly supposed to be very different, one from another, are now known to be identical in every respect, except, perhaps, in their external forms; every year sees the list of so-called elementary substances decreased instead of increased in number, and there is strong reason for believing that there is, after all, but one form of matter which makes itself manifest to us under different aspects. He is an ignoramus who asserts that it is *impossible* that lead and gold can be identical. All that he can truthfully say is that they appear to us to be very different from each other, and that science has not yet demonstrated that they are the same substance under different forms. The same ignoramus, with little less sciolism, would just as emphatically declare that two substances as unlike each other in all obvious characteristics as a diamond of the first water and a piece of common charcoal are as distinct from each other as night from day.

The fact is that, outside of the domains of mathematics and physics, there are no impossibilities in nature. For instance, two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time, and two and two added together can never, under any circumstances, be any other number than four; but many things which are ordinarily regarded as impossible, simply because they have not yet been proved, may to-morrow become established facts. The sagacious critic reserves his opinion relative to unfamiliar subjects and those which are apparently at variance with his idea of the laws of nature; but he knows how little he really knows, and therefore waits, ready to believe or disbelieve, in accordance with further developments and new facts.

Now, there is nothing inherently impossible in a so-called "elixir of life"—that is, in a substance that, when taken into the system, may so arrest the deteriorating influences of old age as to prolong life and to render existence more tolerable. Neither is there anything unworthy in medical science in the search for such an agent. There are persons, and they seem to be especially numerous in the profession of medicine, who, never having made an original observation themselves, or performed an experiment outside the grubbing routine of their daily drudgery, cry "quackery," and "humbug," and "fraud" at everything new that is brought to their attention. It is something of which they have never previously heard, and which they have never

investigated, and which, therefore, must be an impossibility. They belong to the same class as those who persecuted Harvey when he discovered the circulation of the blood. His detractors expelled him from the medical societies to which he belonged, refused to consult with him, and denounced him as an impostor. Had it not been for the open countenance of the King, they would probably have succeeded in burying Harvey and the circulation of the blood in a common grave. Many of us know how, even in our own time, the discoverer of anæsthesia was stigmatized as an ignoramus and a quack.

It is only necessary for a physician anxious to enlarge the boundaries of his science to announce some discovery of the virtues of a drug, to be pounced upon by these narrow-minded donkeys with ridicule and abuse. In their eyes all innovation is quackery. To hold views different from theirs in regard, for instance, to the functions of an organ of the body or the power of a remedy is an immorality not less in heinousness than picking a pocket or committing a burglary. The experiments are necessarily fictitious, the cases are manufactured for the occasion, and the would-be discoverer should be placed beyond the pale of association with the body of his profession. Fortunately in this age of the world there is a power in public opinion which keeps malicious sloths and dullards with their noses to the grindstone. They never rise to the level of respectable mediocrity in their profession, and the truth prevails in spite of their impotent rage and pitiable ignorance.

But while there is no impossibility in an "elixir of life," it is very certain that until now all the attempts that have been made to discover such an agent have resulted in disappointment, and this not so much from anything inherently improbable in such investigations as in the manner in which they were conducted. Up to the present time the subject has not engaged the attention of the medical profession for several centuries. One of the latest works on the subject is that of Fra Donato D'Eremita, published in Naples in 1624, and it must be confessed that, from the standpoint of the science of the present day, it is rather a ridiculous production. It contains a great many engravings of instruments and apparatus of a complicated character for the attainment of ends that might just as readily have been reached by much simpler means. For instance, there is a cumbersome arrange-

ment for effecting distillation by the agency of the sun; the rays being received upon a mirror and thence transmitted to a retort. There is another, consisting of an alembic with a series of receivers one above the other, the lower one receiving the grosser products of the distillation, while the higher catches those that are more refined and ethereal. The substances of which his "elixir" was made were vegetable, animal, and mineral, to the number of nearly a hundred. Among them were valerian, cassia, cinnamon, mace, aloes, artemesia, honey, vipers, musk, asphalt, bezoar stones, coral, pearls, sapphires, emeralds, agate, gold, silver, topaz, and others "too numerous to mention." It was regarded as a specific in more than three hundred different diseases, among them being gout, apoplexy, loss of sight, cancer, carbuncle, catarrh, dysentery, epilepsy, herpes, paralysis, tabes, and various mental affections.

The difficulty with Fra Donato is that the virtues of his "elixir" are entirely hypothetical. Experiment and fact are altogether foreign to his investigations. He assumes that the various agents entering into his compositions possess certain properties, and from this assumption he infers, with a degree of positiveness equal to that of the obstructors of scientific research to whom I have referred, that it must necessarily be possessed of curative powers far in excess of those belonging to any other known remedy. And yet, after all, there is nothing *impossible* in the claims of Fra Donato. He simply omitted the very necessary preliminary of proving that his pretensions were based upon facts, and it would take a great many facts to establish his "elixir" as a therapeutical agent or a prolonger of life.

Now, let us see how a searcher for an "elixir of life" would go to work in our own time.

There are two ways by which such an agent could be discovered, if in reality such an agent exists.

First—By empiricism.

Second—By investigation and research.

It is seldom the case that new remedies for diseases are discovered by any other means than by empiricism—that is, unreasoning experiment. A physician in search of a remedy for a disease with which he is unfamiliar, experiments with various substances which he imagines may be of service in his treatment. Sometimes more by accident than by any other cause he makes a

surprising discovery. This was the case with ether, the anæsthetic properties of which there was no reason to suspect from any knowledge of its properties we formerly possessed. The discovery of the virtues of Peruvian bark and its alkaloids in the treatment of malarial affections was also a matter of pure empiricism. The anæsthetic properties of cocaïne could not possibly have been deduced from a knowledge of its chemical composition or of its action upon the organism when taken into the system. The like is true of mercury, the bromides, the iodides, and many other remedies, without which at the present day it would be impossible to practise medicine successfully. The "elixirs of life" compounded by Paracelsus, Roger Bacon, and others, consisted of substances chosen mainly by caprice or from some fancied analogy with the principle of life, the powers of which upon the human system were wholly unknown.

The object of true science is, of course, to lessen the domain of empiricism, while increasing that of rational therapeutics; but, at the same time, it must be borne in mind that the first object of the physician is to abolish suffering and to save life, and that for the accomplishment of these ends he is justified in using any means that, with or without reason, he thinks may be of service. Take, for instance, such diseases as hydrophobia and tetanus, from the first-named of which not a single case of authentic recovery is on record, and from the second of which the cures are almost infinitesimal in number. To experiment in the treatment of either of these diseases is a physician's bounden duty, for there is no known remedy for either of them. Of course, the scientific physician experiments in a more rational way than does the sciolist. His knowledge of anatomy, physiology, pathology, and of the general effects of medicines, gives him a great advantage over the ignoramus, and, if his patients recover, he is careful how he ascribes the result to his treatment rather than to the inherent forces of nature residing in the patient. But it has often happened that the ignoramus has hit upon a remedy for a hitherto unmanageable disease, when science, with everything in its favor, has ignominiously failed.

Again, a physician carefully studies the nature of the disease in regard to which he sets out to obtain a cure. He observes its course as it affects the lower animals; he makes dissections and brings all his knowledge of chemistry and microscopy to bear

upon the point at issue. He makes his experiments in the first place in his laboratory with medicines the actions of which are in a measure known to him, and which he has, therefore, reason to suppose he may find to be of value. Thus we will imagine a patient to be suffering from congestion of the spinal cord. We want a remedy that will lessen that congestion by constringing the blood-vessels. It has long been known that ergot has the power of contracting the organic muscular fibres of the uterus. The muscular fibres of the blood-vessels are of the kind called organic, and differ from the muscular tissue of the arms or legs, for instance, in the fact that they are not under the control of the will, and that, unlike these latter, they are not marked with transverse striæ. There is, therefore, some reason to suppose that ergot might contract the blood-vessels, and hence be of service in the treatment of spinal congestion.

But the evidence is not yet quite complete, for the organic muscular fibres of the uterus may be one thing and those of the blood-vessels another, in some way unknown to us, although they look precisely alike when examined with a microscope. Now, we take a frog, examine the web of his foot with a microscope, and then put a little ergot into his stomach, and in a short time we see the blood-vessels of the part contract and in some cases become so small as not to admit of the passage of the blood corpuscles. This is additional evidence, but there is still more to be had. We expose the spinal cord in a dog and then dose it with ergot. We see that a like result takes place as in the frog, for under its influence the blood-vessels of the part become smaller. We repeat these experiments many times, and then we are justified in saying that ergot contracts the blood-vessels of the spinal cord. Still we are not yet sure that its action in a diseased cord will be similar to that in a healthy cord. We give it to a patient who is suffering from congestion of the spinal cord and he recovers; and yet we are not sure, for the result may have been due to some other agent of which we have no certain knowledge. We repeat the experiment again and again. Sometimes our patients are cured, and again we fail. The failures may be due to the fact that all people are not alike, and that the system of one absorbs the medicine while that of others does not; that the disease may have advanced so far as to be beyond the reach of any remedy, or that we have made a mistake in our diagnosis

and have had to deal with some other disease than spinal congestion. So that, after all, the most that we can say in regard to the matter is that ergot is beneficial in some cases of spinal congestion.

Within a few weeks intelligence has been received in this country that Dr. Brown-Séquard, of Paris, certainly the most eminent living physiologist, especially so far as the nervous system is concerned, has been experimenting with the expressed juice of certain glands of the body with a view to discovering its effects when taken into the human system. The newspapers (not Dr. Brown-Séquard nor any other authority, so far as I know) have designated this juice the "Elixir of Life." As a result of his investigations he announced in an address delivered before the Société de Biologie, of which he is president, that, after a dozen or more injections under the skin of his own body of the juice from these glands taken from guinea-pigs and rabbits, he experienced a change that might almost be regarded as a rejuvenation. Dr. Brown-Séquard is seventy-two years of age, and he says he felt as though a weight of twenty years had been lifted from his life. He refers to other experiments performed upon the lower animals, all apparently leading to similar results. In addition, Dr. Variot relates the details of three cases of old persons in which, under like treatment, like effects to those obtained by Dr. Brown-Séquard were produced.

The first information received in this country of Dr. Brown-Séquard's researches was through a telegram to a New York newspaper, conveying such imperfect details, however, that the writer was disposed to question either the authenticity of the report or Dr. Brown-Séquard's mental equilibrium. It was apparently stated that various glands of the body were used in his experiments, and that Dr. Brown-Séquard had suddenly become a very much younger man than he had been. Further information, however, showed the exact nature of his experiments and of the claims which he had set up in their behalf. The writer therefore determined to examine into the matter for himself, and as the result of his investigation he is enabled to give, in such general terms as are suitable for a secular journal like THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, a confirmation of Dr. Brown-Séquard's statements, so far as his researches have extended. And not only this, but he has apparently shown that muscular

rheumatism of long standing has been entirely relieved after a single injection of the juice in question. He has been careful to state, and he still so declares, that all the experiments performed up to this time are not sufficient to establish the claims of this glandular juice as an alleviator of old age or a curer of any disease whatever. The whole matter is yet in its experimental stage, and it will there remain until the subject has been examined into by many physicians under different circumstances, and a general coincidence of opinion obtained. A large part of the newspaper press of the country, with the sensational head-lines which they put to every communication on the subject, have done everything to give that exaggerated idea of Dr. Brown-Séquard's investigations which they now affect to deplore.

Now, Dr. Brown-Séquard did not go blindly to work with his experiments, for every intelligent physician knows the relation which exists between the glands in question and the mental and physical condition of the animal to which they belong. There is much *à-priori* reasoning to support the conclusions at which he has arrived. They are not based upon empiricism, but are rational investigations carried out with intelligence. Whether or not he has made any permanent addition to our means of assuaging the infirmities of old age or of curing disease, time alone can show. But those physicians who denounce honest investigation in this or any other direction are unworthy of the profession to which they belong, and should be relegated to some limbo where they can enjoy their self-satisfaction without coming in contact with their more energetic brethren.

WILLIAM A. HAMMOND.

COMMON-SENSE AND CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM.

BY GENERAL JOHN POPE.

PERHAPS there has been no subject more discussed in this country during the past ten years than the question of a reorganization of our civil service. Unfortunately, however, it has been treated, as most discussions on kindred topics have been treated by us, with a constant squinting to the practice of other governments and an apparently uncontrollable tendency to imitate some foreign system which seems to have worked favorable results in other countries. Yet there is nothing more certain than the fact that a system of civil service, like a system of government, which would be suited to a people and to political conditions so different from our own would be wholly unsuited to us. Indeed, the fact that any such system worked well in France or Germany or England would not only *not* be presumptive evidence that it would suit us, but actual proof that it would not.

The spirit of the people, their conditions of life and habits of thought, their experience of government, the absence, as in no other country, of all class distinctions, and the repugnance to such distinctions, must all be considered in determining on any organization, civil or military, for the service of the people of this country. Of course, there are certain general principles which must underlie all organizations among men; but the number of systems and the infinite variations among them, based upon these accepted foundations, can only be equalled by the varied religious creeds of the Christian world, which all rest for their authority upon one book.

Nor can there be a greater and more misleading fallacy than the oft-repeated saying, as if it were an axiom not to be gainsaid, that "the business of the government should be conducted on business methods."

There could hardly be found in the world organizations whose objects are further apart or in more direct moral conflict than the government of the United States and the great corporations or private combinations for making money. The practices of these last-named associations are what are known as "business methods." It is wholly unnecessary to point out in detail the differences in the *personnel* of these organizations, in the manner of selecting and appointing their officers, in their duties and their relation to their employers (who in the case of the government are the people), and, indeed, a thousand others that might be mentioned. A moment's thought will make it plain that to use the methods of one to carry on the business of the other would be a piece of folly of which the business man would never be guilty.

In everything relating to these matters we appear still to hark back to the monkey condition of imitation. If England is successful in its civil-service methods, the idea of our reformers is to adopt English methods at once. If Germany, with its military organization, wins a campaign this year, we are urged by our military reformers to adopt the German military system immediately, to be changed for the French, if France should by chance be successful next year. These recommendations are made with the most dogmatic emphasis, and without the smallest consideration of the wide differences between the people to be operated on and the conditions under which they live. It does not appear to have occurred to our reformers that such matters should be thought of as essential elements in any plans for reform, and that no system in this country can work well unless fully grounded on these popular traits, either natural or acquired as the outcome of our institutions. I might illustrate this proposition by an examination of our army system, which is based on these foreign models, and is and always will be unsatisfactory and unpopular. It is a foreign body injected into our body politic, and, like a foreign substance introduced into the system, is sure to irritate, if it do not produce disease.

In considering, therefore, a system of civil service to be adopted by the government, careful study must be given to the characteristics of our people, which make us quite a different race from any of the civilized peoples of Europe, however great may be our outward resemblance.

In the first place, our theory is that this is a government of the people; that all public officers, from the President down to the smallest tide-waiter, are their agents and servants; that the people are the sovereign, and bound to do a sovereign's duty in looking to the welfare of the country and selecting proper persons to represent them in the counsels of the nation. So strongly do we hold this theory of government, and so deeply has it entered into our life, that we have given the same right to vote, and to take part in governing the country, to almost every inhabitant, from the centenarian to the child in arms, and have thrust the ballot into the hands of every immigrant who lands in New York before he has ceased to curse the authorities and arrangements at Castle Garden.

One of the most serious complaints to-day is that so many of our citizens fail to take any other part in performing the duties of citizenship, and it is justly maintained that, being sovereigns, all good citizens are bound to do the duty of sovereigns. To base a system of civil service upon the proposition that no office-holder shall take any part in the political movements of the people, except merely to vote, is repugnant to our whole idea of government. In the midst of this dissatisfaction that so many people neglect the duties of citizenship, it naturally creates surprise that an order should be issued or a law enacted practically to disfranchise every office-holder in the country by depriving him of half his rights and duties as a citizen merely because he has been chosen for a public trust. One hundred thousand citizens of the United States, belonging, presumably, to the most intelligent and respectable classes of the community, are thus to be deprived of all participation in public affairs except what is covered by a mere vote. Instead of public office being an honor, it has become, or will become, under such a system, a reproach to the incumbent. Surely it cannot be intended that public offices in this country shall be thus rated. It is precisely the advice and influence of such members of a community as those who hold public office which are needed to aid the general voters of the locality in arriving at suitable opinions and action as to questions of public policy upon which the country is called to pronounce a decision. It is a far greater injury to the general public to deprive them of the counsel and active aid of one of their most respected citizens than any possible

harm which could come to the mere perfunctory duties of his office.

I think it may be safely said that the people of this country will not give their sanction to either of two features which are essential parts of the system of civil service we are now attempting to put in operation. First, they will not consent that a large number of presumably intelligent and respectable men shall be practically disfranchised to the extent of being prevented from active interest in public affairs; and, secondly, that they will never degrade the public offices of the country by making it more or less a reproach to accept one. In short, they will not consent to saddle this country for all time with a hundred thousand political eunuchs, who hold the offices of trust, but are for that reason incapacitated for the duties of good citizens.

There are other considerations which would seem to militate against the experiments we are making. One of the principal is the fact that Administrations in this country go into office on some well-defined policies, which have been submitted to the people of the country, thoroughly discussed before them, and adopted. The Administration placed in power in this manner is simply the agent of the people to carry out these policies, and this agent is bound to use lawfully, but vigorously, the means that the principal has placed in his hand to make them successful. That he should receive no help in this duty from the hundred thousand other agents having, in their degree, the same responsibility to the people would appear strange and deplorable; but that the chief agents should themselves forbid these subordinates to help them is amazing. Not only is it demanded of the new Administration by this system that it shall decline the help of its appointees, but it is also required to keep in offices of trust and influence numbers of persons who oppose the policies which the people have commanded to be carried out, and who most assuredly used their best efforts to defeat them at the polls. Thus would the government leave its opponents, weapon in hand, to resist its purposes, or replace them by members of its own faith, after first disarming and partially dishonoring them. To say nothing of the unwisdom of such a policy, it is an injustice to the people of the country, who are entitled to the active help of its servants to bring its measures to a successful issue. The attempt to restrict

the rights of citizenship of any class of respectable persons in this country must fail, in the nature of things; and it is quite sure that no law or order can ever prevent the office-holder in the United States from doing his full work as a factor in the elections. I think it will be admitted that our experience so far has confirmed this statement. It is a well-established axiom that it is bad policy to make a law or issue an order which cannot be enforced, and certainly no law, such as I understand this order to be, can be enforced in this country unless a considerable majority of the community supports it. It certainly cannot be truthfully stated that this order about office-holders has ever been thus supported. Indeed, it is open to direct inference that the President himself recognizes this condition.

I think it may be safely said that government in the United States will continue to be carried on by political parties, and that the public offices will be held by the adherents of the party in power. This I believe to be not only certain, but right and wise. I base this belief upon what I consider an undeniable proposition, which is this: every Administration in this country goes into power to execute some policy which the people have determined on, and the executive department of the government, its agent, is bound to use all the means placed at its command, within the law, to make this policy successful. If the executive officers fail to do this, from highest to lowest, they fall short of the duty they owe to their employers. For the people of the country to decide upon a policy to be pursued, and then consent that all the public offices be held by men seeking to bring that policy to grief, is almost as absurd as to replace these enemies by friends who are forbidden to help.

I by no means intend to assail the reform of the civil service. I only purpose to present certain objections to the system we are trying to put in force, which seem to me to militate against any prospect that it will be successful. In the same spirit I venture to make some suggestions as to the requirements of a system which shall conform more nearly to the feelings and habits of our people, and be, therefore, more willingly supported. Such a system must allow the widest latitude of personal and political action to the incumbents of public office, great and small, and must, at the same time, make the responsibility for their appointment direct and unavoidable, and the remedy of quick and easy application.

In no way that I know of can this be accomplished more easily and thoroughly than by enforcing our theory of local self-government in the appointment of public officers, as in so many other matters of importance to the country.

No doubt the President is the appointing power, and is, in theory at least, responsible for the conduct of his appointees; but the President is far away from many of the communities which may be cursed with inefficient or corrupt public officials, and the criminals may well say, as the Campbells of old were wont to say to their enemies, "It is a far cry to Loch Aw." The President holds his office for a comparatively long period, and performs his duties in a distant city. The influence of any single community weighed little in securing his election to office, and can do even less to benefit or injure his administration.

His responsibility for an inefficient or corrupt office-holder is, therefore, not only very remote, but it is well-nigh impossible to appeal to him with the hope that the appeal will ever be considered. In this strait the people are driven to their Member of Congress, who, having probably been ignored in the appointment of the obnoxious official, is, naturally, not on such terms with the President that his interposition would avail much. Neither the President nor the Cabinet official in whose department the objectionable official serves has, of course, much interest in the community concerned, nor in the matter which disturbs it, so that it is not too much to say that the hope of correcting such an evil as inefficiency or bad conduct on the part of an official of the General Government, in any except very prominent localities and extreme cases, by an appeal to Washington, is not encouraging. To make this responsibility more direct, and to assume that the remedy can be immediately applied by the community concerned, should be the first object in considering a system for appointments to public office, and such a system must pay proper respect to the theory of local self-government, which is an integral part of our institutions, and hardly less valued than the most important clauses of the Constitution. It is not entirely sound to say that the politicians brought about that condition of the civil service which we are seeking to reform. There is an instinct among the people of this country concerning all great public questions which is the real cause of every situation in which public business or methods are at any time found.

There is no theory to which we hold more strongly than the distribution to many hands of the great powers of government, and this sentiment has led us to contemplate with extreme distaste any attempt to concentrate these powers in fewer hands than a strict construction of the Constitution clearly warrants. The patronage of the government, which to-day includes the appointment of nearly a hundred thousand civil officers, is an enormous power for good or for evil. It is not easy to compute what would be the influence that could be wielded by this great army of active and intelligent men, each occupying an official position of greater or less power, and each using it for the interest of one and the same man. It involves a danger which the people instinctively feel, and on this feeling the politicians base their demand for some consideration in the appointments to public office. It cannot be denied that this great power to appoint the public officers, if corruptly used or applied to selfish ends, threatens serious damage to our institutions, which will grow greater as we increase in population and wealth. We should treat this great power as we would treat a public enemy. We should divide and distribute it among as many hands as efficiency of service would justify, and create so many and such varied interests within its exercise that it cannot be wielded *en masse* and no part of it can be used for the benefit of any of the great officials of the government. It is certainly wise to treat every public man in this country, especially so high a functionary as the President, as equally subject to temptation as ourselves, and liable to yield in proportion to the amount of inducement. If any President is pure and blameless in these matters, he certainly is a much better man than the majority of his fellow-citizens and sinners. In point of fact, no President is much better or worse than the average of his countrymen. It is certainly wisdom, therefore, to expose him to no more temptation than the necessities of his position require. It is usual to say that the President is responsible for the performance of the public business, and should, therefore, have the uncontrolled power of appointing the agents to do it; but he is not responsible in any such sense or to any such degree as is implied in that statement. A general commanding an army in battle is responsible for its being well or ill managed, but no one pretends to assert that he should have the right to appoint the officers under his command. He is responsible, just as the President is responsible, only for his

own acts and his good faith in doing them. It is only to a very limited extent and in a remote degree that the President can be said to be responsible for the bad conduct of his appointees—a responsibility which has never greatly affected his political standing or future career.

Briefly, then, it would appear to me that so great a power as that of appointing a hundred thousand office-holders, distributed over the whole country, and dependent on the will of one man or three or four men for their positions, is too menacing to the well-being of the country to be entirely confided to a President and his Cabinet. It is, in my opinion, due to this instinctive feeling of the people—and no doubt a sound feeling—that the practice grew up (and for a long time was a sort of tacit understanding) of allowing members of Congress to indicate, to a considerable degree, most of the Federal officers appointed in their respective districts. The remote responsibility of the President for the faithful performance of their duties by these widely-scattered officials thus became a direct responsibility upon the members of Congress who nominated them. The people concerned are very sure to demand that the duties of the public officers in their midst be faithfully performed. Every man in the community feels in his own person any neglect of a public officer to do his duty, and the communities themselves are the principal sufferers from inefficient service of such officers. Regardless of politics, they will insist on good administration when their own interest or convenience is concerned. It is not difficult to see how strong a control in this matter the people could exercise under such a condition, and how little under the system we are now experimenting with. The remedy and the punishment for bad appointments to office can thus be applied directly to the party responsible for such appointments by the community which suffers from them.

It is not to be questioned that the enormous patronage of Administrations in this country is the most fruitful source of public corruption. Whether it is wiser to concentrate this great power, with all its incentives to misuse, in the hands of two or three or a dozen men in office in Washington city, and thus poison the very sources of administration, or to distribute it widely over the country, where its power to produce any serious danger will be lost by attenuation, is a question of the least importance. And

in this connection it may be pertinently asked, Who shall be consulted and whose recommendation shall carry most weight in appointments to public office? The natural reply to this question would be that, of course, the Representative in Congress from the locality concerned is the proper person. By no possibility can the President possess such extensive personal knowledge of communities and men all over this country that he himself can select appointees to office intelligently. He must consult some one; and who would be the most likely person to give him the information he needs, if it be not the Representative in Congress from the district where appointments are to be made? Is it not rather a reflection upon the people that the President should neglect or ignore the opinions and recommendations of the men they send to Washington to represent them?

There are certain great offices which the President is empowered under the Constitution to fill by his own appointment and with the consent of the Senate. There are other offices, by far the most numerous, the creation of which and the appointments to which are regulated by an act of Congress. Why not, then, make the experiment of distributing this great power of appointment among the members of Congress, to the extent, at least, of having it clearly understood that *in the first instance*, except in special cases, the Federal offices in the country shall be filled by persons recommended by the member of Congress from the district concerned? If the appointee prove unfit,—and that fact will soon become known,—the member of Congress who designated him will lose his influence with the Administration and his political standing at home. The partial practice of something like this idea in the past has not been a fair trial of it, because it was not directly known that appointments were made as a rule on the recommendation of members of Congress, and it was always possible for them to say of a bad office-holder that they had not been consulted or their advice acted on. I make this merely as a suggestion, with the belief that we cannot make our condition much worse, and that we shall at least have distributed to many more hands the exercise of a power which is potent for evil in the inverse ratio of the number of people who possess it. This distribution of power, which it is perfectly within the province of Congress to make, is certainly in the direct line of our demo-

cratic theory of local self-government. It certainly would make more direct, and easier of remedy, the responsibility for bad appointments.

The tenure of office in the civil service seems to be quite as troublesome a question as the matter of appointments to office, and has, perhaps, been as much discussed. There is, no doubt, a great deal that can be said on both or on all sides of this question; but it would seem wise to begin the consideration of it by classifying the office-holders not so much according to the nature of their duties as according to the localities and the environment in which they serve. To illustrate the suggestion I intend to make, a classification of these employees into those who serve in the District of Columbia and those who serve in their States will, perhaps, be sufficient.

The duties of the officials serving in the District of Columbia may be stated generally as supervisory, the clerical force being merely employed in studying and recording details incidental to this object. These officials practically remove from their own States, abandon their former business and home, and take up their temporary residence, at least, in Washington. Indeed, it may be said to be their permanent home, since the cases are rare in which an office-holder in Washington ever leaves that city so long as he can remain and solicit reappointment. Their duties and associations are wholly confined to that locality, and they have no power to use political influence or take part in political movements, except a mere nominal claim that they have their homes in the States whence they were appointed—a remote claim, and one in general contradicted by the facts. These minor officials in Washington, having only the routine business of their offices to perform, the same under all Administrations,—and being entirely without any field for political work, should, in my opinion, have a tenure of office based on good behavior and the efficient discharge of duty, and should not be displaced by any change of Administration, except for the causes indicated.

They are, in fact (and should be so recognized), persons without political power or influence, and placed beyond the reach of any use for political objects. They should be required to give up their residence in the States whence appointed, so long as they hold office in Washington; and whilst there they should possess all the rights, personal and political, enjoyed by the people of

the District of Columbia, and no other. This tenure of office would also free Washington from a large part of the army of importunate and unhappy people who now beset every person of standing and influence with applications for office, and would free the incumbent of office from the continual dread of removal, which now impairs his value and embitters his life. In this manner they would become the servants of whatever Administration might be in power for the performance of duty in the office of the great executive departments, and offer no temptation to enterprising candidates for office.

The position of officials who serve elsewhere than in the District of Columbia is altogether different. They continue to reside in the localities for whose service they are appointed; they carry on, in many cases, their own business, in addition to that of the government; they maintain their status, social, business, and political, in the communities where they live. They should perform the duties and exercise the political privileges enjoyed by every other citizen. In short, their relations to people and transactions in the localities where they reside are in no respect changed except so far as certain public duties which they perform are concerned. These duties and their efficient discharge are of direct personal concern to every member of the community. This community will soonest know and most loudly protest against bad conduct and bad administration of public officers in its midst. The strict performance of the public business is all that the government can properly exact from its servants. That secured, the office-holder should be as free as any other citizen to take whatever part he pleases in public affairs. Any attempt to deprive him of this right will be of doubtful good and very doubtful success.

The tenure of office of such officials should, in the nature of things, be a different matter from that of the office-holder at the seat of government. The public officers scattered all over this broad country, and distributed to the obscurest and remotest localities, and exercising, as they certainly will, all their influence in favor of the policies of the political party to which they belong, must be in harmony with the party to which the government has been for the time committed. Otherwise an Administration would itself actually keep on foot a large and well-posted force to defeat the successful execution of the very policies on which it went into

office. In the nature of political parties in this country, such a condition of things can never be. Whilst the saying that "to the victors belong the spoils" has been made odious in this country, the expression itself, as it is interpreted, is an unfair and misleading statement of a fact which exists, and perhaps ought to exist. It does not mean actually that to the successful party at the polls belongs the plunder of the people; but it no doubt does mean that the office-holders shall sustain the Administration in executing the policies which the people have placed that Administration in power to carry out. That the public officials will take part in the elections is pretty sure, whether in compliance with or against orders, and an Executive is compelled to have either friends or enemies in the public offices. It does not seem to me doubtful what will be the result of such a situation. I repeat the belief that the public business confided to these officials will not be materially affected by their active participation in political movements, and that the people of the communities in which their duties are done will assuredly, irrespective of party, compel them to be faithfully performed.

I think, then, that with our form of government, and the wide liberty and practically unlimited rights of its citizens in this country, which we cannot abridge, it would, perhaps, serve the purpose of civil-service reform for the present if it should be decided that the office-holders in Washington be appointed by the President and the chiefs of the great executive departments of the government, and that their tenure of office should be during good behavior and the faithful performance of their duties. This rule can be enforced without invading the rights or privileges of the citizen, since such a tenure of office would require that the appointee change his residence to the District of Columbia, where for him there would be no field for political action which could affect anything more important than the local affairs of the District. Being under the immediate supervision of the chief executive officers of the government, the responsibility for their appointment and their conduct in office would be directly and unavoidably fixed. This responsibility, and the power to exact the penalty of it promptly, should be the basis of the whole system of appointment to offices, and it is in this view that I make the foregoing and following suggestions.

I propose that, in the first instance, the officers whose ser-

vice is to be in the States whence appointed shall receive their appointments on the recommendation of the Senator or the Representative in Congress from their district, except in special cases and for special reasons. With the power to remove these officials at any time, the President would possess all the authority to enforce faithful performance of duty that he would have under any system, whilst the community would, in like manner, be able to deal with its member of Congress, who would be responsible for the appointments, and who would thus be liable to lose influence alike with the Administration and with his constituents.

Abstract theories and sentimental views of public policy are often interesting and occasionally useful; but we are a practical people, and whilst recognizing the abstract beauty and wisdom of such theories, we base our action largely upon the environment in which we are placed, and the circumstances which surround us. While perfect good should be held in view, we know that we can make only an approximation to it, and in considering the present question and its answer we are subject to the conditions which our form of government and the feelings and habits of our people impose upon us. It is only by careful study and consideration of these conditions that we may effect any organization of the civil service which will secure efficiency and prove acceptable to the public feeling.

JNO. POPE.

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF THE CIVIL WAR.

IV.

BY GENERAL VISCOUNT WOLSELEY, K. P., ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF THE BRITISH ARMY.

I WISH to remind the reader of these articles on the Civil War that they deal only with the information supplied by *The Century* magazine's history of that struggle. The story there told so graphically is treated from the military student's and the military critic's point of view, and it is earnestly trusted that no one may be offended with anything contained in these articles. Many may differ from the conclusions arrived at, and the views expressed may be often or always mistaken; but they are, at least, the honest opinions of one who has the most sincere admiration for the combatants on both sides, and for the many great soldiers and statesmen who then directed the destinies of the United States of America.

The readers of these *Century* magazine papers owe a debt of gratitude to the editors for the pains with which they have collected the various documents. The references to the parts of other papers on the same subject, and to the official publications of the losses and numbers of combatants on both sides, are very useful. But there is one respect in which I would venture to suggest improvement, if any future edition should afford an opportunity. It seems ungracious, where we have been supplied with such a large and costly number of maps, plans, and pictures, to find fault with this aspect of the series. Unfortunately, however, there is one thing needful for a military reader which has not been adequately provided. The text does not seem to have been carefully read by any editor who is in the habit of following, upon the corresponding maps, the movements described. The consequence is, it frequently happens that names of places are men-

tioned in the text which do not appear in the maps. It is not too much to say that for all purposes of intelligent military study, if the reader had to depend solely on these maps, there is much in the text which might almost as well be omitted. Even when, after much search, the place named is discovered in some map or other, the map in which it is found is often not that which has been prepared to elucidate that part of the narrative. One does not, consequently, get the place shown in relation to other localities described. From time to time references are given to particular maps, but these references are not sufficiently frequent. The references required to other portions of the text, in support of evidence educed, are good and ample, and it is much to be regretted that similar care has not been taken to guide the reader to the map required to elucidate the text upon all occasions.

The third volume covers a series of the most deeply interesting operations of the war. These are, in the East, Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, and Gettysburg; in the West, Perryville, Vicksburg, Port Hudson, Chickamauga, Chattanooga, and Knoxville; to which I may add, for the purposes of this article, the papers at the end of Volume II. on the Mexican campaign and the battles of Iuka and Corinth. To these battles no reference was made in my article in last month's NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, because they are closely connected with the general sequence of events in the West, which are recorded in this third volume.

For many reasons the three great battles in the East will be considered first.

General Longstreet has made certain comments upon the whole series of papers on those events, which serve as a convenient basis for a discussion of the interesting questions which rise out of them. He himself had a brilliant share in the victory at Fredericksburg. He was absent from Chancellorsville, but he tells us that on his return to the army, prior to the invasion of Pennsylvania, he propounded certain views and principles to General Lee with regard to the general conduct of future operations. I have already quoted Jackson's views as to what he considered to be the guiding principles of war. It is worth while to compare them with those that are laid before us by General Longstreet.

Neither general would probably wish to have a few sentences, such as are here given, taken to represent his whole mind on so large a subject. Nevertheless, it is always a point of some value to

notice what are the aspects of the art and science of war which are most forcibly and most constantly present to the mind of an able soldier, for he is almost sure to insist on them, rather than on others, when he has to decide between the advisability of certain plans and methods.

I must, however, express a feeling, which will, I think, be shared by many of those who fought against Generals Lee and Longstreet, that it is not pleasant to read reports by the surviving general of conversations between the two in which he seems to have treated, not to say reprimanded, his great leader more like a school-boy under instruction than like one of the most brilliant commanders and remarkable men of his own, if not of all, time. Whatever other great qualities as a soldier General Longstreet may possess,—and he certainly does possess some very brilliant qualities,—that of appreciating the military genius of the commander under whom he served cannot be reckoned among them.

Most of us think that one commander has seldom been more thoroughly outgeneralled by another than General Hooker was by Lee at the Battle of Chancellorsville. No one has expressed that view more strongly than have the distinguished soldiers who served under Hooker in that battle. Even those who express the warmest appreciation of the skill which Hooker displayed in the manœuvres which brought the army to Chancellorsville think very strongly that it was the difference between the two commanders which sent the Federal Army in retreat back over the Rappahannock, as the result of that battle.

In that battle at least one Federal corps had been utterly broken up and disorganized, though the Federal Army, much better armed, and with an artillery overwhelmingly powerful, numbered 130,000, and the Confederates only 60,000, men. With such a disproportion of force, that the effect of the battle should have been, not merely to stop the invasion of the South, but to open the way for the Confederate invasion of Pennsylvania, would seem, one would say, to imply that the Federals had been "outgeneralled." Yet, on returning to the army, General Longstreet's only view, not alone of this campaign, but of that in the Shenandoah Valley under Jackson, of the first and second Bull Run, and of the Peninsula campaign, appears to have been expressed by saying that "one mistake of the Confederacy was in pitting force against force. The only hope we had was to outgeneral

the Federals." "The time had come (*sic*) when it was imperative that the skill of generals and the strategy and tactics of war should take the place of muscle against muscle."

"We"—that is, Longstreet and Lee—"talked on that line from day to day, and General Lee, accepting it as a good military view, adopted it as the key-note of the campaign." I do not know how it will strike others, but to me there is something unspeakably pathetic about the picture of Lee—that man alike of marvellous modesty and marvellous genius, who by his skill and daring was then exciting the admiration of all that world from which he was cut off—thus closeted with his carping lieutenant. How could Lee do otherwise than accept it as the key-note of his campaign that he must endeavor to compensate for the numerical weakness of his army by the skill of his dispositions? On what else had he to rely than the devotion of his soldiers and their confidence in him? But how cruel a blow to such a man must it have been to discover that, after all their campaigns together, the general who was now left him as the right arm on which he must rely had formed this conclusion as to all his handling of the army in the past! Apart altogether from mere personal feeling, which, seeing that Lee was human, must have been sore enough, how serious a weakness did this disclose in one of the most important elements of his possible strength! Imagine the difference between having to rely for the carrying-out of your plans upon a soldier whose judgment and estimate of you were of this kind, and upon one who had for you the feeling which Jackson showed for Lee when he declared, "That man is a phenomenon. I would follow him blindfold anywhere." Yet it was from the same campaigns that the two great lieutenants of Lee had drawn these opposite conclusions.

We are not, however, left in any doubt as to the nature of the strategy which Longstreet desired to see adopted, or the nature of the experience on which he founded it. He writes:

"I then accepted his proposition to make a campaign into Pennsylvania, provided it should be offensive in strategy, but defensive in tactics, forcing the Federal Army to give us battle when we were in strong position and ready to receive them. . . . I stated to General Lee that, if he would allow me to handle my corps so as to receive the attack of the Federal Army, I would beat it off without calling on him for help except to guard my right and left, and called his attention to the battle of Fredericksburg as an instance of defensive warfare, where we had thrown not more than five thousand troops into the fight, and had beaten off two-thirds of the Federal Army, with great loss to them and slight loss to *my own* troops. I also called his attention to Napoleon's instructions to Marmont at the head of an invading army."

Now, it is certainly not wished to disparage the advantages of this method, where it can be adopted, of offensive strategy and of defensive tactics. Most generals believe distinctly in the possibility and advisability, under certain circumstances, of taking up such a position that by your doing so your enemy will be forced to elect between an attack under very great disadvantages upon your strong position and the abandonment of some most important object. But as the wise man has said of "every purpose under the sun," so it may be said of war, there is a time to attack and a time to refrain from attack, a time to defend and a time to abandon the defensive. Judged by the criticism General Longstreet offers of the action of others, his principle would appear to imply that, when an army has the opportunity of striking a series of blows against isolated fragments of its enemy, it ought to refrain from taking advantage of them in order to adopt the policy he advocates. It is needless to point out how directly that principle brings him into conflict with the admirable views on war of Stonewall Jackson, which were quoted in the article on this subject published in the July REVIEW.

Of the Fredericksburg campaign, apart from the battle, we unfortunately get very little account in these papers. Most students of war will, it is thought, consider the especial brilliancy of that campaign to have depended upon the mode in which Lee succeeded in bringing up Jackson exactly at the right moment. This was done so cleverly that the Federal commander committed himself to the attack on the Confederate Army under the impression that he had little more than Longstreet's corps to deal with. Without that application of Jackson's principle, Longstreet would have intrenched at Fredericksburg in vain. It is not often you can induce your antagonist to attack straight to his front the position you have worked at for weeks to strengthen, and especially where it is a position upon which he can bring no adequate artillery fire to bear. To quote Napoleon as meaning that, when an opportunity presents itself, you ought not to strike with your own concentrated army that of your enemy before it is concentrated; that you ought not, as Jackson did at Chancellorsville, to bring an overpowering force upon the flanks and rear of an exposed wing which can be dealt with before it is supported, will seem absurd to any one who knows what Napoleon did, and why it was he so severely criticised Marmont's proceedings.

Indeed, it is difficult to believe that an able soldier like General Longstreet can really mean this. There is often an indisposition, not uncommon among able men, to play second fiddle, and to be very critical of the first fiddle. It is easiest to account for General Longstreet's proceedings by assuming that he was no stranger to this feeling. In order to enforce the wisdom of the advice he gave his chief, General Longstreet records a forecast that he made in regard to the battle of Sedan. He would appear not to have closely studied the circumstances of that battle, for otherwise he would be aware that, while he was quite right in predicting that "MacMahon's army would be prisoners of war in ten days" from the time at which he spoke, he was entirely wrong as to the method by which that result would be brought about. The Prussians at Sedan did not "force MacMahon to attack," but attacked *him* on all sides. They carried Bazeilles after fierce and bloody attacks. They carried by attack La Moncelle, Daigny, Givonne, the plateaus above Floing and Illy, and the Bois de la Garenne. They only refrained from an actual attack with their infantry upon the immediate neighborhood of Sedan because, having already secured by attack all the positions which commanded the valley, they were able to bring such an overwhelming artillery fire to bear that the French position became untenable.

In no sense whatever is the battle of Sedan an example of offensive strategy and of defensive tactics. The campaign of 1870 and the principles of war followed by the German leaders are most unfortunate authorities for General Longstreet to appeal to in support of his special views. The modern German writers on war seem to enforce a theory the exact opposite to that of General Longstreet, to an exaggeration as extreme on their side as his appears to be on the other. They for the most part seem to admit as little as he does "that there is a time for every purpose under heaven"; there is, however, this one great difference between them: that, whereas he assumes the one great method of war to be that of offensive strategy and defensive tactics, they, most of them at least, continually urge that offensive strategy implies offensive tactics. They are also very strongly impressed with a view which, if we may judge from their conduct of war, appears to have been that of both Stonewall Jackson and of Grant, and perhaps that of Lee also—that defensive tactics carried on behind intrenched positions have a very dangerous tendency to unfit soldiers for all rapid

offensive action. That is a serious element in the whole question which must be taken into account. It is completely ignored in General Longstreet's criticism of Lee.

In these remarks, the actions of Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville have been taken together, as the story of those battles seems admirably to illustrate Lee's principles and method, and to clear the way for the discussion of Gettysburg also.

I cannot, however, pass on to the Gettysburg campaign without calling attention to Lee's mistake in allowing the Federal Army to escape across the Rappahannock after the battle of Fredericksburg. To command in war for many campaigns and make no mistakes is impossible. General Lee, great in strategy and able in tactics, is no exception to the wisdom of this saying. Military history can only be made of use to the student of war by a close criticism of every operation, and the critic, no matter how humble, should not shrink from pointing out what he conceives to be the errors and mistakes made by even the most renowned commanders. General Lee made some mistakes in his most brilliant career, but the greatest was after the battle of Fredericksburg. The more closely his conduct then is studied, the more inexplicable it appears. The reasons he gives in his published despatches for having failed either to push the Federal Army into the river or to compel its surrender are most unsatisfactory, most insufficient. (Page 82—note.) When the last Federal attack was repulsed on that eventful 13th December, Burnside's army was at Lee's mercy. It is, however, easy to be wise after the event, and to point out what might or ought to have been done. When Wellington realized that the battle of Waterloo was won, he is proverbially reported to have suddenly shut up the telescope through which he had been looking, and to have given the order, "Up, Guards, and at 'em." He felt that the time had come for passing from the defensive to the active offensive, for he saw that Napoleon's army had been delivered into his hands. Yet that army had no unfordable river, like the Rappahannock, immediately behind it. Had the French army on the evening of the 18th June, 1815, been situated as Burnside's army was on the evening of the 13th December, 1862, none of it could ever have succeeded in recrossing the Belgian frontier into France.

It has always seemed to me that, if Burnside's army had been destroyed, as it ought to have been, after its crushing repulse at

Fredericksburg, the struggle between North and South would have assumed an entirely different aspect, and subsequent events would not have been as they were. That army was by far and in every way the finest under the Federal flag, and was the nucleus of that which afterwards fought at Gettysburg, and which eventually forced General Lee to surrender. The prize in front of the great Confederate general was enormous. He would doubtless have lost very heavily had he left his position of vantage to push the defeated Federals into the Rappahannock, but the losses at Chancellorsville and by many other subsequent battles might have been thereby saved. Lee does not seem to have realized how great was the Federal loss and how serious the demoralization of their army on the evening of the 13th December. He made up his mind that Burnside would renew the fight next morning, and the pages of *The Century* magazine tell us how fairly justified he was in thinking this, as they show that Burnside meant to have done so. Had the Federals attacked again on either the 14th or 15th December, judging from Lee's general mode of fighting, I think we are entitled to assume that he would, without doubt, have followed up a second repulse of the Federal attack by such an immediate and vigorous offensive as would have annihilated Burnside's army. It must be admitted that, whilst Lee's position was admirable for a passive defence, it was very bad for the sudden assumption of an active forward offensive when the enemy's attacks upon it had been even crushingly repulsed.

During the course of this long war some great opportunities were lost by the Confederacy for the delivery of a death-blow to the Northern armies. But upon no other occasion was the opportunity so apparent, or the results that would have attended success so evident, as at Fredericksburg. That battle was a brilliant success. Lee ought to have made it a crushing, if not a final, victory.

Burnside's retreat to the North bank of the Rappahannock during the stormy night of the 15th December was admirably conducted, and most creditable to the Federal generals and staff officers who carried it out.

Every one is agreed that the first day's fight of Gettysburg was brought on without Lee's having expected it. On that day two Federal corps had been severely handled by very superior Confederate forces. The Federal Army was neither concentrated nor

were its corps near enough to the battle-field to be concentrated by the time that the Confederate Army ought to have been able to attack them. The evidence adduced as to the position of the Confederate corps is incontrovertible. Colonel Allen, in his reply to General Longstreet (page 355), has shown conclusively, not only that the reports of all the division commanders at the time are directly against General Longstreet's assertion that his divisions were "fifteen or twenty miles away from the battle-field on the night between the 1st and 2d July," but that General Longstreet's own official report at the time contradicts his recent statement on this point. The soldier instinctively admires the fine fighting qualities of General Longstreet, but the student of war called upon to express an opinion upon his conduct, when second in command to General Lee, sees much to find fault with. General Longstreet tells us (page 340) of his somewhat fierce discussion with his chief on the afternoon of the 1st July as to the plans that should be followed in the next day's battle. The account we have already had of his earlier conversations with Lee upon the general conduct of the war throws an interesting light upon what must have passed through Lee's mind during those discussions.

That Lee felt the necessity of keeping on the kindliest terms with his able, but argument-loving, lieutenant is evident. He bore with characteristic humility what must be termed the essentially disrespectful attitude of mind towards him of the man on whom he was obliged to rely for the most important stroke of the whole war. But that all the time Lee's own mind remained clearly fixed on the policy of adopting either offensive or defensive tactics, according to circumstances, is manifest from the firmness with which he rejected Longstreet's proposed plans. He was determined not to lose the opportunity which chance had thrown in his way, for the very doubtful possibility of being able to manœuvre round the Federal army—an operation which would, at least, certainly afford that army time to concentrate against him. By all that is recorded in this volume of General Longstreet, by his whole conduct on the 2nd and 3rd July, and by the tone and temper of his present writings, it seems very evident that he quitted Lee on the night between those two days with his mind filled with the fixed idea of defensive tactics. His thoughts were apparently too much absorbed with his own plans to admit

of his paying a properly strict attention to the orders and directions of his chief. Yet upon their prompt and accurate execution depended the success of Lee's far more brilliant and far wiser scheme of action.

General Longstreet has appealed to Napoleon. Those who have most carefully studied Napoleon's methods and habit will think, I believe, that Napoleon in Lee's place would have attacked in the early morning of July 2, as Lee intended to do. Those who have closely followed the history of this war will also be inclined to think that, if Jackson had been in Longstreet's place, the attack would have been delivered before 10 A. M. at the latest.

With the evidence given in this volume before us, few can doubt the truth of Colonel Allan's statement (page 356) that

> "General Longstreet, though knowing fully the condition of things on the night of the 1st, knowing that Lee had decided to attack that part of the Federal Army in his front, knowing that every hour strengthened Meade and diminished the chances of Confederate success, and knowing that his corps was to open the battle and deliver the main assault, consumed the time from daylight to nearly 4 P. M., on July 2, in moving his troops about four miles over no serious obstacle and in getting them into battle."

The evidence now laid before us goes far to show that General Longstreet was not only responsible for the fact that his own wing attacked so late that almost the whole Federal Army was concentrated before the stroke was delivered, but also for the fact that he was, when the attack was delivered, not properly supported by the other parts of the army detailed to coöperate in the attack. When the principal attack, on which all others depend, is delivered at least six hours later than it is ordered to be delivered, it is impossible that coöperating corps should time their movements so as to support it. General Longstreet has clinched the evidence as to the cause of the imperfect success of the battle on the second day, by urging that Lee had not ordered the attack to be delivered at the earliest possible hour on the 2d July. The direct evidence brought against him on this point is, however, very clear, although even without such evidence it would still be clear to all who closely study this great battle that the whole point and scheme of Lee's battle manifestly depended on the attack being delivered at the earliest possible moment. If General Longstreet had not been too much absorbed by his own ideas of the way in which the campaign ought to have been fought, to pay attention to the literal and prompt execution of his chief's orders,

he must have seen for himself that suddenness and earliness in the attack were of the essence of that scheme.

Similarly, in the third day's battle all the evidence goes to show that, if Pickett's attack had been supported by the whole force of Longstreet's corps and the division and a half of H. P. Hill's corps, which were put at his disposal, that attack would have succeeded. The picture of General Longstreet not even able to make up his mind to order the charge of Pickett's division recalls the bitter memories of our own attack upon the Redan in September, 1855. Upon that occasion our final repulse was due to want of support. No effective arrangements had been made to reënforce the British troops engaged in the assault, who, left without support, were easily disposed of by the fresh troops of the enemy brought to bear on them. No operation in war is so bloody, nothing is so cruel to all concerned, as the weak decision which allows an insufficient force to engage in an attack from a disinclination to expose more than a small number of men to the risks it entails. How many serious disasters have been occasioned by the tender-heartedness of the commander who lacked the moral courage to launch heavy columns in support of men engaged in an attack like that attempted by General Pickett!

As to Lee's decision to attack on the third day of Gettysburg, intending that attack to be adequately supported (as, however it was not), it is very interesting to compare this battle with that of Grant at Chattanooga. Few will contend that the advantages which General Grant had gained during the first two days' fight at Chattanooga were so great as those which Lee had gained in the first two days' fight at Gettysburg. On the first day at Chattanooga, the 23d November, 1863, Thomas's force seized the picket lines of the enemy in front of him by a sudden rush. On the 24th, Hooker, on the right, drove in a small force of the enemy, and secured the evacuation of Lookout Mountain, and Sherman forced his way to a position detached from the enemy's right; but up to the moment when the successful charge was made in the centre by Thomas, General Sherman had entirely failed to force his way on the left, and General Hooker had not made good his advance on the right. No doubt the charge of Thomas, as actually ordered, was not intended to be carried forward in the way it was. But a comparison between the circumstances of Thomas's successful charge at Chattanooga with the

failure of Pickett at Gettysburg will show that a large element of the uncertain prevailed in each case, and that it by no means follows that, because Pickett's charge proved in fact disastrous, Lee was therefore wrong to order it, or that, if it had been properly supported, it would not have succeeded. Even if we had not the direct and specific evidence of General Imboden, we could not doubt that the words he has quoted must have represented the secret thoughts of Lee.

"I never saw troops behave more magnificently than Pickett's division of Virginians did to-day in that grand charge upon the enemy. And if they had been supported as they were to have been,—but for some reason not yet fully explained to me, were not,—we would have held the position, and the day would have been ours."

After a moment's pause he added in a loud voice, in a tone almost of agony, "Too bad! Too bad! Oh, too bad!" (Page 421.)

The whole story, as told by General Imboden, of that casual meeting with Lee at 1 A. M. the morning after the last day's battle, seems to leave no doubt as to what Lee's view of the facts really was. Nothing is more characteristic of the man than that, when quietly reviewing the situation, he should realize how all-important it was to the cause of the Confederacy that no personal differences should arise between him and Longstreet, and that he should consequently have taken all the blame upon himself. Most soldiers will think that General Longstreet has not served his own cause well by appealing so much to the generous silence of his chief. He has, at least as far as all future histories of the war are concerned, deprived himself of the benefit of that silence by the way in which he has laid himself out to make charges against the chief who refrained, under the most dire provocation, from one word of reproach against him. The sneer about the appointment of Virginians to command has been well answered by Colonel Allen; the sneer about Stuart's "wild ride around the Federal army" (page 355), which General Longstreet asserts was undertaken in disobedience of his own orders, is unfortunate, as Colonel Mosby (page 251) shows from the original document that it was made by General Longstreet's own order, after the question had been expressly referred to him by General Lee: the errors he has fallen into as to the position of his own corps prior to Gettysburg are similarly confuted by the original documents. These, and not a few other matters of similar character, seem to deprive Gen.

eral Longstreet's statements of at least some of their value as evidence, and his criticism of all value as that of an unbiassed judge.

There is in the record of General Longstreet's battles a uniformity of incident as marked as that noticed in the case of some other generals. In the first day's fight at Seven Pines, according to all the best evidence that is before us, General Longstreet's division was so long in getting into position and preparing for attack that the whole scheme of General J. E. Johnston miscarried. General Johnston has too great a respect for his lieutenant, and is too generous a man, to reproach him for the miscarriage. At the second Bull Run, according to General Longstreet's own report (page 519, Vol. II.),

"As soon as the troops were arranged, General Lee expressed a wish to have me attack. The change of position on the part of the Federals, however, involved sufficient delay for a reconnoissance on our part. . . . The position was not inviting, and so I reported to General Lee. . . . General Lee was quite disappointed by my report against immediate attack along the turnpike. . . . General Lee urged me to go in, and, of course, I was anxious to meet his wishes. At the same time I wanted more than anything else to know that my troops had a chance to accomplish what they might undertake."

And so on *ad libitum*—Lee always anxious for attack; Longstreet deliberating and postponing action. In his one brilliant and successful attack during all these battles—that at Chickamauga—Longstreet, being commander of the Confederate left wing, and having orders (page 652, Vol. III.) from Bragg to "begin at daybreak," did not (page 655) "advance until noon," by which time the action of the other wing had caused a gap in the Federal lines through which Longstreet, brilliantly taking advantage of the error, advanced and caused the Federal defeat. "Discovering, with the true instinct of a soldier, that he could do more by turning to the right, he disregarded the order to wheel to the left, and wheeled the other way." Destiny may have shaped these results, but one is much mistaken if there is not evident in each of these actions the hand and mind of the same man who rough-hewed each of them according to the same temperament—the hand of one man who was much better adapted to repair the errors of a second-rate commander than to carry out the purposes of such a chief as Lee. There is a greatness of soul which may be shown in subordinating even a better judgment to the perfect carrying-out of the scheme of a leader who has the right to decide. Of any recognition of that fact on General Longstreet's part in his relations with Lee, no trace is to be found in any one

of these actions. That Longstreet was a brilliant leader of a division or wing in action there can be no doubt, but he seems never to have been able—perhaps from some peculiarity of temperament—to subordinate his own views heartily to the views and orders of his great chief. The impartial military critic must admit that at Seven Pines, the second Bull Run, and Gettysburg, the Confederacy paid dearly for that defect in his character.

In one respect there is a rather remarkable similarity in the incidents of the Gettysburg and of the Chancellorsville campaign. In the latter campaign nearly the whole of the Federal cavalry had been detached from the army in order to throw itself between Lee's position on the Rappahannock and his base at Richmond. The major portion of the Federal Army then crossed the Rappahannock, and the battle of Chancellorsville was fought whilst the Federal cavalry was thus absent. During the Gettysburg campaign, Stuart, with a large portion of the Confederate cavalry, had been detached round the rear of Meade's army, and the other portion of the cavalry, having been, by the course of the movements, thrown out of the line between the two armies, Lee was left with no cavalry in his front at the moment when the collision between the two armies unexpectedly occurred at Gettysburg. There is just this difference—that during the Gettysburg campaign the absence of the cavalry was contrary to Lee's intention. He had calculated upon its being possible for Stuart to return to him before the collision should take place. The difficulty which a body of men, launched like those of Stuart upon the rear of an army, find themselves in, is well likened to the position of a man turned blindfold in a room full of enemies. It was that difficulty which prevented Stuart's return till the eve of the battle. In the case of the Chancellorsville campaign, Hooker's scheme deliberately involved his being deprived of the services of the cavalry during the course of his whole campaign. In both cases alike the result seems to show that, when armies are manœuvring against one another in the field, it is a risk too great to be worth running, even for the sake of breaking in upon the communications of an enemy, to deprive the army of its eyes, as one must do if the bulk of mounted troops are sent off on some entirely isolated operation.

The case of Stuart's ride around McClellan, during the Peninsula campaign, is altogether different. There the armies were for the time stationary when opposite one another. Lee had no

intention of undertaking any movement till his cavalry had returned. Stuart brought back most valuable information, which assisted greatly in the general movements of the subsequent campaign. Similarly, the partisan work of small parties like that of Colonel Mosby may serve a most useful purpose, and cannot be conducted with too much audacity. But Stoneman's raid seems to have gained advantages for the Federal Army which, though important, were dearly purchased by the loss of the battle of Chancellorsville. The more one considers that battle, the more clear it becomes that it was the absence of the Federal cavalry which made possible Jackson's turning movement. Under ordinary circumstances, the detachment of so large a force as that of Jackson's to move at first completely away from the battle-field, and then round the enemy's flank and rear, would be a very risky undertaking. It was possible and successful, first, because from the nature of the country nothing of the movement could be seen from the actual Federal position until it was too late, and, secondly, because the Confederate cavalry were able, in the absence of any corresponding force on the other side, to feel all the approaches to the Federal position and to ascertain exactly where their right wing lay. The small number of possible exits from the Federal position towards that of Lee made it possible for Lee to hold them as if they were defiles, whilst Jackson, with the help of the cavalry, was working round to the vulnerable point.

The whole story of the Federal action during these battles seems to carry the same moral as that which is pressed in my first article. The decisions from Washington and the criticisms from Washington, based upon the loose and rampant public opinion of the day, were in every instance wrong, and were disastrous to the cause of the Union. Well would it be if the survivors of the Administration by which those hasty judgments were formed would now realize what the effect was of their deciding upon the course of action to be taken without having before them any of the data for such decisions. If now they would only understand the danger they entailed upon their country by their interference in the conduct of war—the most difficult of all arts—without any knowledge of its methods or of its principles, one might hope that the chastened and wise public opinion so formed would be an incalculable future benefit to all self-governing nations.

[To Be Continued.] WOLSELEY.

THE COMING CONGRESS.

BY THE HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

THE FIRST session of the Fifty-first Congress promises to be a very interesting as well as a very important one. For the first time in fifteen years every branch of the national government is in the control of the same political party, for in 1881, although the Republicans organized the Senate, it was equally divided, and Mr. David Davis was in the chair. Now, however, each branch of Congress, and the Executive as well, is fairly within the control of the Republican party, and this condition of things, occurring as it does after an interval of so many years, ought of itself to produce effective legislative action. The only hindrance to efficient party control is the very narrow majority by which the Republicans hold the House; but this would have comparatively little effect on the transaction of general public business were it not for the existence of a much more radical evil which is destroying the life of the Lower House, and which for some time has made all majorities powerless. The evil to which I refer lies, of course, in the body of rules under which the House now exists. Originally reasonable, and established to facilitate the transaction of business, the rules of the House have been developed into an ingenious contrivance for stopping practically all legislative action which does not receive a unanimous vote. The development has been slow, but the result is as complete as it is pernicious.

The American House of Representatives to-day is a complete travesty upon representative government, upon popular government, and upon government by the majority. The purpose of the rules, as I have just said, is merely to facilitate the transaction of public business, but they have become so perverted that they serve only to stop public business, and when they are attacked we are met by a cry about the "rights of the minority"! The "rights of

the minority" have been so well protected in the House that the rights of the majority have disappeared. If the minority, in thus usurping the rights of the majority, could act and could govern, as they do in the Southern States, we might object to the system as wrong and unconstitutional, but it could, at least, be said for it that it was not stagnation. In the House of Representatives, however, the minority simply reduce the majority to their own impotent condition, and the upshot is that nobody governs and nothing is done. The last Congress, which was in longer continuous session than any other Congress in our history, if we throw aside the measures which received unanimous consent, passed practically nothing except one great party measure, and that went through merely because the opposition chose to allow it to pass. It seems almost incredible that men should be found in the United States to defend a system like this, for the government of the United States proceeds, if on nothing else, on the theory that the majority ought to govern. Yet the theory on which the House of Representatives was organized in the last Congress was that the majority ought not to govern. If the system of rules in the House of Representatives is right, then the entire American system of government from top to bottom is wrong. The minority in the national House have the right to debate any important measure, and to debate it amply. They have the further right to sufficient time to call the attention of the country to any measure; that is, they have the right to prevent a measure from being smuggled through or passed hastily, without sufficient discussion, and under the party whip. But beyond this they have no rights, except to appeal to the people at the next election. If they had, they would not be a minority, but a majority, and in control of the government. The opportunities for obstruction under the Constitution, and under any system of rules that may be adopted, are more than enough, but the time has come when these artificial fetters must be taken off the House of Representatives. If a majority cannot be trusted to rule in this country, then we should try something else; but while we live under the majority system a majority ought to have, and must have, a chance to act.

This question of restoring movement to the House of Representatives is that which will confront the Fifty-first Congress at the threshold of its existence. It is not a party question, or ought

not to be, and although, from the stand-point of party advantage alone, it would be an admirable thing for the Republicans to have the Democrats make a desperate struggle in favor of the old paralyzing rules, it is much to be hoped that sufficient changes and reforms will be made by general consent to change the condition of the House from dead rot to vitality, and enable it to carry out the wishes of the majority of the American people, whatever those wishes happen to be. There are indications that public opinion is becoming aroused to the disgraceful condition of the rules under which the House has lately been stagnating, and if press and people will demand that the House fulfil the purpose for which it exists, a valuable result will be speedily accomplished.

The contest over the rules is the first thing with which the Fifty-first Congress will be called on to deal, and until it is settled nothing else, practically, can be done. When this is settled,—and it must be settled rightly, or else the Fifty-first Congress will never do anything except wrangle over the rules,—the time will come for dealing with other measures of a widely different character from a set of parliamentary regulations upon which the legislative machine revolves.

What these measures shall be, and in what order they shall be taken up, no one, of course, can say until Congress assembles and the Republican caucus determines on some line of action. It may fairly be inferred, however, that the first business which will engage the attention of the House will be the reduction of the surplus revenue, for this action is imperatively demanded by the business interests of the country, and the party in power is completely pledged to it. The Democrats, under their free-trade leadership in the last campaign, argued throughout, both in Congress and before the people, that the question at issue was whether the surplus should be reduced or maintained. This, of course, was totally misleading, to use a very mild word, for the Republicans are quite as deeply pledged to reduce the surplus as the Democrats. It would be manifestly unfair, however, to condemn any party for inaccuracy of statement when that statement was made during an exciting campaign, in which the stress of battle was very great and the temptation to crush truth to earth was correspondingly strong. But thoughtful persons must have observed with pain and surprise that, even since the election was over, the ardent Free-Traders have continued to argue as if the con-

flict was still over the reduction of the surplus, and that the Republican victory meant its perpetuation. It might be matter for curious inquiry to determine whether this continued perversion of the real issue was due to ignorance of public affairs, or to that professional enthusiasm for reform which unthinking persons sometimes call disingenuousness. It is not necessary, however, to enter upon a discussion of that point here. The real issue has never been, and is not now, whether the surplus revenue should be maintained, for both parties are agreed that it ought to be abolished. The real issue of the last campaign was how that work should be performed—whether in accordance with the principles which would lead toward free trade, or with those which would insure the maintenance of the protective system. The verdict of the ballot-box was in favor of the Republican party, or, in other words, it was decided at the polls that the reduction of the surplus and the revision of the tariff should be made upon the protective principle. The method by which the surplus shall be reduced has therefore been settled,—a point which our free-trade friends, with their minds occupied with higher things, are prone to overlook,—and it only remains for the Republican party to fulfil its pledge of reducing the surplus revenue, and thoroughly revising and adjusting the tariff in accordance with the principles on which it has been carried to victory.

It would be manifestly unbecoming for me, or for any single member of the House, to attempt to indicate before the assembling of the Republican Congressmen and Senators the precise manner in which this work should be accomplished. There can, however, be little doubt, I suppose, in any one's mind that it will proceed in a general way upon the lines marked out by the Senate bill in the last Congress, which was the product of some of the ablest of the Republican leaders, and which in its main features received at the time the general approval of the party in Congress. The central principle of that bill was to reduce the surplus by taking off the tax on tobacco and by reducing very heavily the duties on sugar. The minute and careful revision of the tariff which accompanied this reduction it is unnecessary to discuss here, even were it possible; but it can be seen that the general policy of the Senate bill not only gets rid of the surplus, but brings relief to a great agricultural interest in the South, and to the entire body of the people

also, who are, of course, all consumers of sugar. Whether the recent growth and development of the Sugar Trust will lead Congress to feel that the sugar duties ought to be wholly abolished, or reduced in a most sweeping manner, remains to be seen, but there is no doubt that this new problem is one which will receive careful consideration when Congress meets. Such a reduction as that suggested by the Senate bill, however, whether it is confined to the original limits, or whether it makes a more sweeping reduction of the sugar duties, would undoubtedly pass, for even if the Republicans did not have a majority in both houses, the interests of the border States are too deeply involved in the removal of the tobacco tax to permit the defeat of any measure providing that relief. The passage of such a bill, therefore, would result in the removal of the surplus revenue for some years, and the consequent disappearance of that particular phase of the economic question from our politics. It would then remain to be seen how a free-trade movement simply for the purposes of free trade, and stripped of its pretences about the dangers of a surplus, would prosper.

There is another matter, more important than any tariff can ever be, which is certain to receive the careful consideration of Congress, although it played but a slight part in the last campaign. This is the question of protecting the ballot by suitable legislation. Public attention has been drawn more and more of late years to this vital subject, and several of the States have made great efforts to guard the purity and honesty of the ballot by the most careful and elaborate legislation that could be devised. There is a disposition, however, in certain quarters, whenever the ballot is discussed from a national stand-point, to take the ground that it is a mere bit of party manœuvring, intended solely as a party cry and to procure a sectional advantage. As the matter stands to-day, this is a wholly mistaken as well as a thoroughly disingenuous position. There is no desire anywhere to revive the sectional animosities of the War, but there is a very general wish and a widespread determination among the people of the North, at least, to have a fair ballot throughout the length and breadth of the land. There is, of course, no doubt of the power of Congress to pass a federal election law for the purpose of regulating the elections which decide the choice of electors and members of Congress. There can be almost as little question of the expediency of a simple but efficient statute which shall

make federal elections as honest as it is possible to make them by legal provisions. Such a law, thoroughly enforced, would be of great value in many districts both North and South, for it would greatly reduce, if not entirely prevent, violence, fraud, false counting, and the use of money for corrupt purposes. The States have enough to do to guard the purity of their own elections, and the protection of federal elections by the United States would be of great advantage to the ballot everywhere. The political party or the political leaders who resist, directly or indirectly, such a law as this, lay themselves open to the imputation that they have something to lose by its enactment, and that they fear an honest ballot.

The question, however, is one of those which cannot be evaded or put aside, and which will not down at any one's bidding. It is an oft-repeated truism that the purity of the ballot lies at the very foundation of our government, but it is not equally well understood that popular confidence in the verdict of the ballot-box is quite as important as the honesty of the verdict itself. At the present time it is believed, rightly or wrongly, by large masses of the American people, that there is no such thing as a fair election in certain parts of the country. This belief, whether well founded or not, is a real and growing danger, which ought to be removed at all hazards, and the next Congress will, therefore, fall far short of its duty and of the expectations of the people if it fails to pass an effective election law. The cry which is sometimes raised that no election law can be enforced in certain parts of the United States is idle. The day has gone by when a law executed by the officers of the United States, and with the power of the United States behind it, can be either disregarded or violated with safety. If an election law properly drawn is passed by Congress, it will be enforced, and although it may not put a stop to all the evils which exist, it will so greatly improve the condition of things, and will do so much toward the restoration of an honest and unquestioned ballot everywhere, that the only wonder will be that we have gone so long without it.

It is impossible, of course, within the limits of a magazine article to attempt to discuss the provisions of such an election law. A bill to regulate elections was introduced by Senator Sherman in the last Congress and will probably be before the next, and it is likely that there will be others submitted looking to the

same general object. The recent laws of some of the States will also serve as material, and although it may be doubted whether the Australian system, which has been adopted in Massachusetts and elsewhere, could be used for a federal system, it seems probable that it contains features which might be applied with advantage. One thing seems certain, and that is—if one can judge from indications of popular sentiment in many of the States—that Congress will be expected by the people to deal with this problem, and that, if the Republican party take it up as a party measure, they will have the cordial support of the country in passing such a law to guard the ballot-box.

After the tariff and the ballot, the most important matter before Congress will be one that requires no new legislation. This sounds like a paradox, but is true of the civil-service question. There is enough legislation now on this subject, for the time has not yet come when the four-years' tenure can be profitably repealed. To remove it now would simply make all tenures indeterminate, and experience shows that indeterminate tenures are as yet no protection, while the four-years' tenure is. In time, this and other improvements can be made, but for the present we have law enough, and all that we require is its maintenance, extension, and enforcement. The President can extend the existing law to other branches of the service and to the smaller custom-houses and post-offices, as he has done already in the case of railway mail clerks; and to enable him to do this it is only necessary to make a proper appropriation for the work of the Commission. This appropriation is now miserably inadequate, and its increase is the vital point to which all supporters of the reform, both in the press and elsewhere, should direct their efforts. It is probable that there will be a contest over this, for the honest and vigorous enforcement of the law since March 4, 1889, has roused its enemies, and attacks in Congress will probably be the consequence. Neither party, however, can afford to have any hand in the open repeal of the law or in an indirect assault by way of cutting off appropriations. The matter has gone too far for that. The distribution of patronage, inevitable for any President or any party under the present system, grows more and more distasteful to the people, and the extension of the Civil-Service Law meets always with the approbation of the great mass of voters who desire only good service and better standards of public life. It is in the latter direction,

which is too often overlooked, that the system of patronage is peculiarly odious. It has converted Congress into a machine for the division of offices, for which it was never intended, and by which its powers are cramped, its action is impeded, and its character injured. Quite recently one of the ablest and most distinguished of Republican leaders, the Hon. William McKinley, has said in an interview that the Republicans are less well able to deal promptly and effectively with the tariff now than they would have been last Spring, when they were not divided by the struggles for offices. What more bitter commentary could be uttered ! And yet no one who knows the conditions of politics can question the fact that the system of patronage weakens and degrades parties and public men, and will continue to do so as long as it exists. In order to rid our public life of a system as un-American as it is unintelligent, Congress needs only to make such an appropriation as will permit the President to extend the law wherever it can be applied, and enable the Commission to carry it out thoroughly and effectively.

The questions of the tariff and of a federal election law will, it seems probable, take up more of the time and attention of the Fifty-first Congress than anything else, for the leaders of the opposition, in some recent utterances, appear to indicate their intention to make a protracted resistance on both these points. Of the wisdom of this resistance it is not for a Republican to speak, but the nature of the questions is such that, from the stand-point of party advantage, the Republican party may be well content to meet the resistance of the opposition. Such a resistance, especially if carried to undue lengths, will not only be unprofitable in itself, but will be injurious to those who indulge in it on many accounts, and particularly because there are so many other measures that have gradually accumulated in the stagnation caused by the rules, which demand the attention of Congress and which interest large bodies of people throughout the country. Such, for instance, is the Blair Bill, which, whatever its merits, has too large and too serious a support, and involves interests too important, to be any longer disposed of by the process of suffocation in the committee-room. Whether the measure is wise or unwise, it is entitled to a fair hearing and a direct vote. Another measure which passed the Senate, and was favored by two-thirds of the House in the last Congress, was the

Copyright Bill. It was finally choked off because the Funding Bill happened to stand ahead of it on suspension day; but it is a great measure of honesty and justice, as well as of vast benefit to all the interests involved, and the time has come when it, too, should have fair discussion and the decision of a vote. Still another question in which there is the widest possible interest is that of immigration. The last Congress appointed a committee who held hearings on this subject and took a great deal of very valuable testimony, which was printed in their report; but the report and the bill alike came to the House too late for action, and the result is that this question, in regard to which there is a great deal of popular feeling, will come to this Congress for decision.

There are many other questions as to which something might be said, such as the Bankruptcy Act, the Refunding Bill, and the proposed amendment of the Inter-State-Commerce Law; but enough has been said to show the great importance of the matters with which the Fifty-first Congress will be called upon to deal. If they fail to act upon these matters, their inaction will meet with severe rebuke at the polls a year hence, unless I greatly misapprehend the popular temper. The people of this country are, as it seems to me, thoroughly tired of the stagnation of business and the general inaction of Congress. They are disgusted to see year after year go by and great measures affecting the business and political interests of the country accumulate at the doors of Congress and never reach the stage of action. They have also waked up to the fact that this impotence and stagnation are due to the preposterous fabric known as the rules of the House, and they are prepared to support heartily that party and those leaders who will break down those rules and allow the current of legislation to flow in its natural channel and at its proper rate. I end, therefore, where I began—by saying that the first session of the Fifty-first Congress promises to be of great interest and importance, and that the first thing to be done is to change the rules of the House thoroughly and effectively, so that the legislation of the United States may be no longer at the mercy of any handful of men who, for personal or party reasons, choose to arrest it in defiance of the majority of the people and of a majority of the House itself.

HENRY CABOT LODGE.

WHY I AM AN EPISCOPALIAN.

BY FREDERIC WILLIAM FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., ARCHDEACON AND CANON OF WESTMINSTER.

I HOPE that I may be able to answer this question without aggressiveness and without extravagance. A man may surely be convinced in his own mind without resenting or condemning the opposite opinion of his neighbor. Truth is many-sided and "God has *many* bests."

It is more than possible that my reasons for being an Episcopalian may seem entirely inadequate on the side of defect to my fellow-Episcopalians, as well as on the side of excess to those who belong to other religious communities. Be it so. A man must say what he thinks, and not trim his sails to every passing gust of the popular breeze. When Phocion was once accidentally applauded during the delivery of a speech, he turned round to a friend in surprise and asked: "Have I said anything *wrong*, then?" When Rostopchin, the Governor of Moscow, was told that he was growing very popular, he exclaimed: "*Mon Dieu!* what blunder have I committed?"

There are two common ways of winning general approval, or, at any rate, of escaping the penalties of arousing antagonism. One is by assuming a strong party position, and answering according to its idols the particular audience which you wish to conciliate. By doing this a man can always secure the support and enthusiasm of vehement partisans. The other way is by never asserting even the most incontrovertible proposition without securing yourself by the assertion that "you do not mean to exclude its contradictory," and by "steering through the channel of no-meaning between the Scylla and Charybdis of 'yes' and 'no'." He who takes the latter course, says Cardinal Newman, will be regarded as "your safe man and the hope of the church." On the other hand, we know the fate of him who goeth about to persuade a multitude that they are in the wrong. Be that as it

may, all my readers, be they partisans or moderates, be they hostile or favorable, may at least rest assured of this: that no amount of theological hatred or ecclesiastical opposition, no fear of persecution and no hope of reward, will ever make me deflect the tenth part of an inch from the statement of anything which I hold to be true, or will ever tempt me to the support of anything which I hold to be untenable or false.

Let me begin, then, by saying that, though I am a convinced Episcopalian, I hold the question of church organization to be altogether secondary and subordinate, and in no sense essential to morality or salvation. I consider episcopacy to be in most cases the best, the most authorized, and, in its rudiments at least, the most ancient form of church government; but I do not regard it as one of the necessary notes of a true church, nor do I consider it to be at all indispensable for the *esse*, or even for the *bene esse*, of any church. The Thirty-nine Articles define "the visible church" to be a "congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." The Prayer-book, in its most solemn service, speaks of Christians as "very members incorporate in the mystical body of Christ, which is the blessed company of *all faithful people.*" Neither here nor in any document of the Church of England is episcopacy insisted on as a thing indispensable. Abraham Lincoln used to say: "Whenever I find a church which inscribes upon its portals the two rules, 'Thou shalt love God with all thy heart' and 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,' to that church will I belong." If that be thought altogether too vague a note of unity, shall we be contented with the rule of Irenæus, "*Ubi spiritus ibi ecclesia*"? or with that of William Penn, "The humble, meek, merciful, pious, just, devout souls are everywhere of one religion; and when death hath taken off the mask they will know one another, though the divers liveries they wear here make them strangers"?

Or, to bring the question more closely home, do we or do we not believe that there is a church of the redeemed in heaven? And is there a human being who supposes that the soul of any man which is admitted into that beatific communion will be questioned whether on earth he accepted or not an episcopal government? Let us avoid the arrogant nonsense of extremes. Let us shun

the pompous platitudes which can only be saved from intolerant and extravagant absurdity by first being emphatically asserted, and then ridiculously explained away. Such a platitude is that which first identifies the church with one of its component bodies, and then says with St. Cyprian, "*Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*" The assertion sounds very grand, very orthodox, very faithful; but when you come to question even the Romish casuists, they are constrained to admit that even Jews and Pagans may be saved, so that, unless they stretch the significance of the word *ecclesia* till its whole meaning cracks, their platitude becomes an empty phrase. Churches will not be estimated hereafter by the boastful arrogance of their claims or the narrow and bitter exclusiveness of their champions, but by the fruitfulness of their works and the beauty of their holiness. The revival and exaggeration of Romish principles in Reformed churches may make these views appear lax to some; yet they are almost *totidem verbis et litteris* the views of some of our most honored divines. Hooker, for instance, has been regarded for three centuries as the most eminent and judicious champion of High-Church principles; yet Hooker says, as William Penn says, that the unity of the church consists in owning one Lord, professing one faith, and being initiated by one baptism; and "in whomsoever these things are, the church doth acknowledge them as her children; them only she holdeth for aliens and strangers in whom these things are not found."

It naturally follows that, though episcopacy seems to me to have the divine *sanction*, I do not in any sense regard episcopacy as a thing of immediate divine *institution* or universal obligation, any more than I regard monarchy. A state may be blessed and flourishing without kings, and a church may be blessed and flourishing without bishops. I do not believe that our Lord, in founding upon earth a divine society, meant also, of necessity, to establish an unvarying organization. He left us an eternal revelation; he reconciled us to the Father; he saved us from the power of sin and death; he set us an example, that we should follow his steps. His work was quite infinitely more transcendent than the mere establishment of a particular model of church government. He gave his Holy Spirit to them that seek him, and under that guidance it was and is perfectly competent for every nation and every separated community of Christians, under the stress of circumstances, to adopt that form of church

government which was or is best suited to its needs. Even to the truest members of his true church—even to the *ecclesiola in ecclesia*—Christ said: "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be"—not one FOLD (*αὐλή*), but—"one FLOCK (*ποίμνιον*), and one shepherd." There is but one *flock;* there are, and to the end of time there always will be, many *folds.*

I neither affirm nor deny what is called the doctrine of "Apostolical Succession." Even Archbishop Laud, the *beau ideal* of the High-Churchman, in his controversy with Fisher the Jesuit, ventured to say no more respecting it than that "it is a great happiness where it may be had visible and continued, and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world. But I do not find any one of the ancient fathers that makes local, personal, visible, and continued succession a necessary mark or sign of the true church in any one place." As an historic fact, I consider it highly probable—indeed, almost certain—that our bishops hold their office by the laying-on of hands, either of presbyters or bishops, from the days of the Apostles. But I do not believe for a moment that the continuity of spiritual gifts is exclusively dependent on these mechanical transmissions; for, as Hooker says, "Men may be extraordinarily yet allowably . . . admitted unto spiritual functions in the church . . . when God himself doth of himself raise up any whose labor he useth without requiring that men should authorize them." I believe that not a few of the best and greatest servants of God in the Christian dispensation have been anointed only by the hands of invisible consecration. If, therefore, it could be shown that there were broken links in the chain of episcopal ordination, it would make no sort of difference to my view of the grace of ordination. Knowing, as we do, that much of the divinest work in all ages has been done by men who were neither priests nor bishops, and often in deadly antagonism to the vast majority of those who were both; and knowing also that "the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every man that is born of the Spirit," our notes of the true church are not the Romish ones of Cardinal Bellarmine, but rather those of Pearson and Field and Hooker and the Reformers and the Articles of the Church of England. And while all of these more or less accepted and valued episco-

pacy, *none* of them insisted on it as an indispensable and essential requisite for true membership of the church of Christ.

Having spoken thus plainly, I may add without suspicion that I regard the episcopal government of churches as very ancient; as having been in some churches primitive; as being in entire accordance with the example of the Apostles; as being, with all its necessary and serious imperfections, the best and wisest form of church organization in most churches, and, apart from overwhelming difficulties, in *all* churches. With our most learned Elizabethan divines, I hold that episcopacy is lawful in its use and primitive in its origin; but I do not maintain for it any indefeasible divine prescription, nor do I regard the bishop as being of an essentially different order from the presbyter, but only as a president among presbyters, endowed with one or two special functions, and with a limited, but neither absolute nor infallible, authority. No one with the least pretence to honesty can any longer deny that in the New Testament "bishop" and "presbyter" are *interchangeable*, though not always or necessarily *identical*, terms; and that the Apostles St. Peter and St. John are quite content to call themselves "presbyters." In the church of Ephesus the same men (Acts xx., 17, 28) are called "bishops" and "presbyters." Paul and Barnabas ordained "presbyters" in their churches. In the church of Philippi we are only told of "bishops" and deacons; and the "presbyters" whom Titus is told to ordain are also called "bishops." The assumption that Christ founded an episcopal organization during "the great forty days" is a mere hypothesis destitute of the shade of a shadow of proof. The church ought to say quite as clearly as Sir Isaac Newton, "*Hypotheses non fingo.*" Bishops are unknown to the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" and to the "Epistle of Barnabas." In St. Clement of Rome "bishops" and presbyters are still interchangeable terms. Ignatius exalts episcopacy in language which would be both unscriptural and extravagant unless it were regarded as being of local and temporary significance; yet he knows nothing of diocesan bishops, nothing of irresponsible and independent bishops, and does not represent bishops as either instituted by the Apostles or as successors of the Apostles. Ignatius writes to the church of Rome without even alluding to any bishop of Rome, any more than St. Paul does in his Epistle to the Romans. St. Polycarp and St. Clement write to the churches of

Philippi and Corinth, and say nothing of the existence of any presiding bishop in those churches. Everything points to the conclusion of St. Jerome that episcopacy did not arise from any *dominica dispositio,* but rather *consuetudine ecclesiæ.*

Yet the positions of St. James at Jerusalem, of Timothy at Ephesus of Titus in Crete, and perhaps of the "Angels" of the seven churches in Asia, offer a sufficient analogy to episcopal government to enable us to say, without the aid of effeminate and fantastic fictions, that episcopacy may claim apostolic sanction. And that sanction is more than sufficiently confirmed by the almost immemorial practice of the church. The church which may in all serious matters claim the living presence and continual guidance of the spirit of God neither needs to invent dubious revelations, nor to manufacture disputable history, nor to place herself at the mercy of archæologists, nor to depend on

> "Critics who dissect the sacred page
> Till God's gifts hang on grammar, and the saint
> Is weaker than the sage."

For her maintenance of episcopacy it is sufficient that she can claim the highest antiquity and the sacred wisdom learnt from continuous experience, as well as adequate analogies from the history of the Apostolic church.

And without urging any other reasons "Why I am an Episcopalian," I should feel it enough to say that the episcopal form of church organization, while it is most in accordance with that which has been all but universally adopted since the age of the Apostles, is also best adapted for the peace, order, and progress of the church's work.

One principle on which we rest the benefit of episcopacy was laid down by Homer many centuries ago. It is οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη· εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω. "Lords many" are an evil in any community, and the church early discovered that the limited independence of one presiding authority was her best bulwark alike against the prevalence of internal schism and the attacks of external heretics. Institutions, like men, must always have "the defects of their qualities," and there was never an age in which prelates might not be tempted to be inflated and violent, worldly and luxurious, tyrannical and unjust. But these dangers may equally occur in any other form of ecclesiastical polity, and in presbyteries also there may be a domineering Diotrephes or an heretical Hymenæus. It may, I think, be laid down as a gen-

eral rule, without fear of contradiction, that, other things being equal, a church will gain by episcopal organization in unity, in vigor, in progressiveness, in power of discipline, and in purity of doctrine. I would point to two conspicuous illustrations—the church of America and the episcopate in the British Colonies.

As regards the church of America, I am told that alone, or almost alone, of the religious communities on the western continent, it is steadily, if but slowly, adding to its numbers, lengthening its cords, and strengthening its stakes. No one, I think, can fail to see that, in the history of that church, the consecrations of Bishop Seabury by two Scotch bishops at Aberdeen, in 1784, and of Bishop White by Archbishop Moore at Lambeth, in 1787, are epoch-making events. Bishop Seabury was a moderate High-Churchman, and Bishop White a Broad-Churchman of the school of Tillotson; but the vigorous understanding of the former and the large-hearted wisdom of the latter, during his forty-years' episcopate, gave an impulse to the Episcopal Church in America which it could hardly have received had they been nothing but leading presbyters. As to the colonial episcopate of England, the number of bishops in the last century has increased from one to seventy-five. Is is but a hundred years ago since Dr. Charles Inglis was consecrated Bishop of Nova Scotia, and now there is no single colony or dependency of Great Britain, of any size or importance, which is not under special episcopal supervision. No one acquainted with the facts will deny that these bishops, *as bishops*, and in virtue of the authority thus specially conferred upon them, have powerfully aided the preservation of the faith, and given an incomparable impetus to the evangelization of the world.

And if proof be required of the blessedness of an episcopal organization in the church of Christ, may we not appeal to the long annals of eighteen hundred years?* Was it not found, even in the second century, that episcopacy was the great centre of unity, the great safeguard of faithfulness, the great bulwark against heresy? In those early days of Christianity how many of the martyrs were bishops! How often—as in the see of Rome, where, of the first thirty bishops, it is said that all but two were martyred—did that humble spiritual preëminence mean only the prerogative of death! What might not have become of the seed-

* The writer here ventures to repeat a few words used in a sermon in Westminster Abbey at the consecration of the Bishop of Tasmania.

ling of the faith in the second and third centuries had there been no St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, to face the wild beasts in the Colosseum; no St. Polycarp, Bishop of Lyons, to brave the flame in the amphitheatre of Smyrna; no St. Cyprian, to bend his noble head to the flashing axe at Carthage! Think of the noble simplicity, combined with powerful eloquence and deep learning, of St. Gregory of Nazianzus and St. Gregory of Nyssa in the fourth century; of how St. Chrysostom carried to the throne of a patriarch the asceticism of a hermit; of how St. Augustine, declining to wear the splendid vestments which were given him, sold them to give to the poor; of how St. Basil and St. Ambrose, St. Martin and St. Hilary, stood before kings and were not ashamed. Think how in the fifth and sixth centuries the bishops were the true and almost the sole defenders of the state. Think how Attila the Hun recoiled before the unarmed majesty of St. Leo; how Odovakar was overawed by St. Severinus; how Theodoric the Ostrogoth was softened by respect for St. Epiphanius; how the brave Totila was impressed by the holiness of St. Benedict. Then think of the bishop-missionaries—of St. Boniface, the apostle of Germany; of St. Augustine of Canterbury; of Bishop Otho of Pomerania. Why need I continue the story, as I might do from age to age, of all those saintly prelates whose brows have been mitred with Pentecostal flame? Why need I pause to mention such holy and humble men of heart as Bishop Bedell and Bishop Ken amid the moral waste of the seventeenth century? or what need is there to point to the sweet and saintly figures of Bishop Thomas Wilson and of Bishop Berkeley, to whom the satirist attributed "every virtue under heaven," during the torpor of the eighteenth century? Is it not enough to show that during all these centuries Wisdom has been justified of her children, and that in our age also they have maintained their spiritual nobleness?

And not only at home, but no less in foreign lands the humble bishops have placed themselves in the very fore-front of toil and peril, and have done a work which it is only possible for bishops to achieve. We think of India, and we recall the fair spirit of Reginald Heber, the quiet wisdom of George Cotton; of Newfoundland, and we recall the apostolic labors of Bishop Field for thirty-five years; of New Zealand, and the image of Selwyn seems to rise before us; of Sierra Leone, and we know how three English bishops died there in seven years, each stepping where his prede-

cessor had fallen. Nor have they all passed away to join the more in number. How many a true servant of Jesus Christ, how many a brave and self-denying standard-bearer of the cross, did we see when the bishops of the Lambeth Conference met last summer in Westminster Abbey! We saw that saintly and beloved old man, the Bishop of Minnesota, who has won the proud title once borne by the lion-hearted missionary, John Eliot, of "the Apostle of the Indians"; we saw the calm and wise bishop who, from his home in the stormy Falkland Isles, has charge of many a scattered congregation through all the vast regions of South America; we saw the bishop of another race, once a slave boy, once bartered for a horse, twice for rum and tobacco; his spirit then so broken that he tried to commit suicide; sold to Portuguese traders, rescued by an English vessel, converted, educated, meeting and converting his parents after twenty-five long years,—the first negro bishop whom the world has seen. And among the prelates of England and Australia and the West Indies and America, there was one—the Bishop of Moosoonee—who has planted the Rose of Sharon in the sub-Arctic wastes, and through whose blessed ministrations the word of the Gospel of Peace has come to many a poor Indian tribe, once degraded and cannibal, in their wigwams on the bleak shores of Hudson's Bay.

Yes, and more even than this. If the blood of martyrs be the seed of the church, is it nothing that, even in a century of such luxury and such materialism as this, we have seen the aureole of martyrdom shining softly round the brows of bishops whom we have known? In the last twenty-two years no less than three such martyrs have been taken from the ranks of the colonial episcopate. In 1862 a dying man, ministering to the dead under an acacia-tree in feverous swamps of Africa, read as much as he could of the burial service, in the deepening gloom of a tropical twilight, over the body of Bishop Charles Mackenzie. That martyr had died, but thirteen months after his consecration, delirious, fever-stricken, on the malarious banks of the River Shire. In 1870, floating, under the burning sunlight, over the blue waves of the Pacific tide, a boat bore from the shores of Nukapu the lifeless body of Bishop Coleridge Patteson, stabbed with five wounds, the knotted palm-branch on his breast, a smile as of heaven upon the pallid lips. In 1885 died in Equatorial Africa a young man in the prime of life and strength, full of fun, full of

vigor, full of high spirits. He had given up home and all its wealth and happiness to be a messenger of heaven through those dreary and horrible regions. He had been often lost in the jungle; often starving; stung by swarms of bees; in constant peril of wild beasts; advancing alone and unarmed to face men whose venomous arrows were poised and trembling upon the string, ready in an instant to smite him with a death of agony; in the midst of savages brutal and revolting; holding not his life dear unto himself, and all for the love of Christ. Yet "so full was my trust in Christ that I laughed amid the very agony of my situation." I have had in my own hands the little *Churchman's Almanack* in which the young martyr wrote his last words from day to day. On October 29 he wrote: "I can hear no news, but I was held up by the 30th Psalm, which came to me with great power. A hyena howled near me last night, smelling the sick man, but I hope he is not to have me yet." The ink was scarcely dry on those last words when, singing hymns, he was led out of the filthy hut in which he had been imprisoned, to die for his Master's sake. Yes, thank God, even the life of this nineteenth century has been redeemed and ennobled by the imperial purple of martyrdom. "We still ring true," says a great writer, "when anything strikes home to us, and though the idea that everything should pay has infected our every purpose, there is still a capacity of noble passion left in the heart's core of Englishmen, and there is hope for the nation while this can be said of it."

Such in age after age, has been the episcopate, and above all that which corresponds most nearly in its conditions to our episcopate in the colonies. Nor can God have given it a nobler mark of his blessing than in putting into the happy hands of so many bishops the palm of martyrdom.

Against other forms of ecclesiastical organization I have nothing to say, but I cannot agree with Pope in the view that

"That which is best administered is best."

If we are to choose the form which, apart from exceptional circumstances, is ideally and absolutely the best, I believe that form to be episcopacy. I am an Episcopalian because I believe that the church acted under the guidance of the Spirit of God in early and finally adopting the rule of bishops as a rule which would best promote the advancement of the kingdom of Christ and the integrity of the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

F. W. FARRAR.

THE VALUE OF INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS.

BY THE HON. JOSEPH R. HAWLEY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT.

THE United States is about to hold another international exhibition. Several times, in varied forms and different places, the proposition has been made and has met ineffectual responses. But now it seems to have passed the stages of "suppose" and "why not?" and become a definite purpose. The city of New York is to take the lead. Its press has spoken vigorously, and a great number of its prominent citizens, for themselves individually, or in behalf of organized interests, have signified their hearty approval and promised their labors.

New York is able, and it is a good work at a good time. In 1892 sixteen years will have elapsed since the Centennial Exhibition—a time sufficiently long to make it useful and pleasant to measure again our progress in comparison with older nations. In 1876 our population was about forty-five millions; in 1892 it will be sixty-nine or seventy millions—a growth of nearly 55 per cent. in numbers and more than that in wealth and power. The world has gained in science, invention, and art, in skill and productive power, in an accelerated ratio from year to year. The international exhibition has justified itself as an institution by its fruits, and it will undoubtedly continue to appear. The intervals must be regulated by the business world's public opinion, but a too frequent recurrence would be checked by the unwillingness of exhibitors. They are the real supporters of exhibitions; their investments and expenditures are heavy and voluntary; they cannot be coerced. France is this year conducting a splendid affair, but, by reason of its political significance, it fails to reach a full international character. We hear of no purpose to invite an exhibition in 1890 or 1891; so 1892 is a fit time, and the nations will be likely to respond cheerfully. The United States is a vigorous competitor and a rich customer.

It is at peace with the world, and desires to continue so. This is neutral ground, where all will meet a generous welcome from us, and where they can greet each other with more frankness and sincerity than at home, in close view of their tremendous preparations for killing one another at instant notice.

We have said that international exhibitions have justified themselves. It is not too much to say that each has cultivated the taste and modified the industries of the nation holding it. Scott Russell, the famous English engineer, writing in 1886, said :

"The last eighteen years have seen a series of events slowly, regularly, and disagreeably awakening the [British] nation from a pleasant belief, once a reality, now a dream. Eighteen years ago there began a series of competitive trials of intelligence and skill between the citizens of the civilized nations of the world. Adam Smith's views of the wealth of nations were to be put to the new trial of competitive examination."

The exhibition of 1851—the Crystal Palace—was a brilliant surprise for the world, but in size and fulness of representation it would to-day be regarded as an exceedingly unsatisfactory attempt.

"In that great school," said Russell, "the nations of Europe learned their first lessons in technical education. They were able to see in how many things England retained her hereditary excellence, and in how many branches of taste and skill other nations possessed qualities in which she was wanting."

This was England's first lesson: her second was at Paris in 1855. "Nothing," said Russell, "was more striking than the enormous progress nations had made from their first lesson." In each group of skill and invention some had taken heed and made advances. "England had been struck by the amazing superiority of some Continental nations in the beauty and grace of design," which sufficed to convert clay and flint "into valuable and invaluable works of art in earthenware and glass." He details the remarkable efforts of England to educate her artisans during the intervening four years. The best models by the best masters were distributed ; schools of design were established for the potteries and glass-works ; teachers for art workmen were trained. England was disgusted with the old blue ware of China and thereafter used it only "to export to barbarous countries." In 1851 France felt her inferiority in manufactures of iron and steel, and by 1855 had made great improvements. England thought it a mere spurt for the exhibition till in the exhibition of 1862 she found it genuine. America sent there "some of her exquisite

machinery for economizing labor," and all around the people were crowding England. The exhibition of 1867, Russell says, "rudely awakened and thoroughly alarmed" England. France surpassed her in steam-engines at sea and on land; also in iron armor and iron for railway forms, buildings, and ship-frames. One of the best things done for England was by the Society of Arts, which sent over fifty-five selected workmen to study their respective trades, whose written reports made an exceedingly instructive volume of 689 pages.

In all these exhibitions the United States appeared, always complaining of the insufficiency of her representation, but always winning much praise and many prizes. In 1851 we had less than 700 exhibitors, but the London *Times* said the American department was second in interest. Colt's pistols, then a novelty abroad; McCormick's reaper, which was deemed a miracle; Powers's Greek Slave, the most heartily-lauded and best-remembered statue in the exhibition, represent classes in which America won honor. The older generation of American mechanics remember their delight when Hobbs opened Bramah's lock in two days, afterward opening and closing it at pleasure, winning a prize of two hundred guineas; and he proceeded to open Chubb's lock in twenty-five minutes for another prize. And every year we hear how we won and keep the cup that Steers's yacht "America" captured when she came in "ahead, with the rest nowhere." Concerning the Vienna exhibition of 1874, it was an Englishman who said: "America seems to defy all Europe to cope with her, run with her, or overtake her. She has the champion display of implements, tools, and machinery."

But while thus appearing everywhere and winning much honor, chiefly for our mechanics, it was not until 1876 that we appeared to take to heart practically the lessons Great Britain began to learn in 1851 and 1855, concerning grace and beauty in form and color, and the necessity of technical education for all connected with industrial pursuits. We found that we remained ahead in inventive skill and genius in a variety of fields, notably in all manner of tools for the shop, labor-saving devices for the kitchen, machines for the farm, and machines and machine tools for the factory. And it is true that in these and a wide variety of other things we used less matter to obtain a given quantity of work, and built with finer lines and less clumsiness, than the foreigners.

But the exhibition had not closed before our potteries changed their forms and struggled for grace, finish, and decoration to meet a more refined and elevated popular demand. In like manner we changed our taste in glass-ware and plated ware, in gold and silver work, in paper hangings, in furniture of all kinds, in curtains and carpets, and all manner of interior decoration, and particularly in domestic architecture. In the latter respect, in a thousand villages and cities the word "Centennial" might be stamped as a trade-mark upon a multitude of houses. The popular taste in engravings, etchings, paintings, and sculpture advanced, and the supply hurried to meet it.

If we did not carry from town to town casts and models and patterns, and provide schools and trained teachers of design, it was because we are not, as a people, so utterly dependent upon foreign trade in our manufactures as Great Britain and France are; because of the subdivision of power between States and the nation; and, lastly, because, even in matters over which the States have exclusive and unlimited jurisdiction, we entertain prejudices against some manifestations of the paternal theory of government. But the longing for art education has brought about some satisfactions. It is a delight to many to see Americans like Tiffany & Co. enter the field at Paris in 1878 and 1889 with forms, designs, colors, and workmanship wholly from American hands and heads, and win triumphs as decisive as that of the yacht "America." It is not enough to tell the manufacturer how to observe true art: the sure way to reach him is through an improved popular taste, which will direct him in search of beauty.

The English, with vast quantities of excellent machinery, did not exhibit largely at Philadelphia, partly because they foresaw no market here for such goods, and partly because they had in many things borrowed from us. As an example: an enterprising iron-manufacturer told the writer that he went by invitation from a meeting of the British Iron and Steel Association to visit an English rail-mill of high rank. He found there in operation the Danks puddler, invented by Samuel Danks, of Cincinnati; the "three-high" rail train, invented by John Fritz, of Bethlehem, Penn.; the Winslow squeezer, invented by Mr. Winslow, of Troy; Blake's crusher, invented by Mr. Blake, of New Haven; the Corliss engine, invented by George H. Corliss, of Rhode Island, and Root's blower, invented by Mr. Root, of Connorsville, Penn.

While every nation usually thinks that it knows what its own products and capacities are, it learns from an exhibition more about itself than about anybody else, and, while it may fortify its reasons for a just pride in some things, its vanity is likely to be a little dimmed. Before 1876 a very large number of Americans were inclined to say hastily that we had nothing specially interesting to exhibit; but afterward they were satisfied that, while it was evidently a country very interesting to other nations, and a leader in some material things, it had a great deal to learn.

A purely national exhibition is practically an impossibility. It would be exceedingly difficult to exclude all articles produced or manufactured elsewhere. The profit lies in comparisons with the works of peoples of older, or otherwise different, civilizations, of various climates, soils, traditions, habits, and processes; and that profit is in geometric ratio to the degree in which the comparison approaches universality.

Evidently there is a general drift toward the opinion that New York is the best place for the exhibition. It is the great commercial metropolis. Hither tend all railways. The water communication, along so many thousands of miles of coast-line, is a great advantage. Were it intended to be an exclusively national exhibition, the argument for Cincinnati or Chicago or St. Louis would be stronger. But as we greatly desire as large a measure as possible of foreign participation, it is wise to select New York, as near the centre of all the exhibiting populations as possible. Since 1876 the comfort, convenience, safety, and rapidity of ocean travel, and the economy of transportation, have gained so much that we may justly expect a larger exhibit of goods than before, and a very much greater number of visitors.

The climate of New York is largely in its favor. The intense heat of midsummer is greatly tempered by the river and the ocean. This consideration weighs heavily against Washington. But there are other and even stronger arguments against that city. Its libraries, museums, scientific collections, the number of scientific bureaus and of learned and zealous specialists, are rapidly increasing. It is fast growing to be the one city above all others fit to be the chief university city of a great nation. But its population is only about 200,000. Its people have not the accumulations of wealth to be found in a city of bankers, merchants, and manufacturers. Held in Washington, the exhibition

would be helplessly dependent on the government for practically every dollar needed. The Congress will undertake no such task.

Both for profit and instruction the greatest possible number of visitors is desirable. All great and even measurably successful exhibitions have been held in large cities. Most of the adult residents of London, Paris, Vienna, and Philadelphia, and of the vicinity within an hour's travel, visited the exhibitions in those places, and many of them many times. The number who come from a great distance is usually exaggerated in estimates. They are valuable visitors, because they come to learn, and carry back and diffuse their knowledge. But they do not supply most of the receipts. Baltimore is the only considerable city within easy reach of Washington. Including all Maryland and fractions of Delaware and Virginia and some of the nearer counties of Pennsylvania, it is doubtful if there are 1,400,000 people within two or three hours' travel of Washington, possibly increasing by 1892 to 1,700,000. A goodly fraction of these are poor colored people.

On the other hand, New York in a similar and fair calculation of the number who could leave home, spend six hours at an exhibition, and reach home that evening, can count about five millions in 1880 and nearly seven millions in 1892. Her extraordinary water and land communication is not to be compared with Washington's.

Among the schemes is one proposing to make the exhibition permanent. There is always a temptation to play with the stick of the rocket after it has performed its function. An exhibition is mostly a collection of what civilization has to show for itself to-day. It is not an ethnological or other museum, exhibiting the conditions and progress of the various races in successive ages; it is a flash photograph of civilization on the run. In its second year its exhibits will mostly be antiquated, its farm products mouldy, its textiles faded and dusty, its metals rusty, its designs out of fashion. From it a few articles might be selected for a museum and paid for. It is the exhibitors who bear the burden. They own their goods and pay for the care of them. When the last day arrives, they take them home. When the doors are closed, the best substitute for the exhibition proper is to be found in the windows of the shopping streets of great cities and in machine-shops, factories, railways, iron-mills, and steamships. A good collection of last year's birds' nests would be

valuable in a naturalist's museum ten years hence; but a "permanent" exhibition of babies would need constant renewal. Attempts at maintaining the permanency of exhibitions have all failed.

The propositions to establish a permanent exhibition, or another museum, at Washington, betray lamentable ignorance of what is already there. In 1846, upon the establishment of the Smithsonian Institution "for the diffusion of knowledge among mankind," Congress placed in its charge all objects of natural history, mineralogy, geology, and all antiquities belonging to the United States. The Wilkes collection went to the Smithsonian in 1856 and became the nucleus around which gathered objects preserved for educational purposes. All our scientific explorations and expeditions, the free gifts of our navy and merchant marine and of collectors of many kinds, the gift by twenty-five exhibiting nations, at the close of the Centennial, of a great collection of objects natural and manufactured, occasional purchases, the labors of the Smithsonian corps, directed by unbounded zeal and the highest scientific knowledge, —these and other sources have heaped up an immense collection of valuable objects illustrating the widest range of studies, until the capacity of the new museum and all other buildings under control for storage even are exhausted. Give the managers room, and there will become visible within ten years a museum unequalled in the world.

In such an institution no class or object comes into competition with any other. It is a collection of object-lessons, or, as Professor Huxley styles it, "a consultative library of objects." There is nothing in the whole scheme of our government which qualified critics at home and abroad commend more highly than its scientific men and their works, and the future of the great national museum is well assured.

Let us, then, direct our effort toward a true international exhibition—a presentation as well-proportioned and balanced as possible of "the natural resources of the country and their development, and of its progress in those arts which benefit mankind, in comparison with those of older nations," and promote and invite a like participation elsewhere.

This article is not intended to offer advice or suggestions. But governmental action concerning the exhibition of 1876 was so peculiar that a reference to it may be instructive. It was a suc-

cession of acts rendered necessary by the imperfect grasp of the first, and by various unforeseen circumstances, chiefly the financial depression of 1874. The original act created a commission from each State and Territory, with power to superintend a plan for an exhibition and with exclusive control thereof, but neither appropriated money nor gave directions concerning the methods of getting it. Wherefore the commission obtained from Congress another act creating a "Centennial Board of Finance," a joint stock corporation authorized to raise, receive, and disburse moneys, erect buildings, etc. This double-headed organization well answered the emergency.

Foreign nations will not send commissioners to or take official notice of an exhibition without official national invitation. The national government is compelled to assume responsibility for the enterprise, and naturally desires a measure of general control over the chief features concerning both our own citizens and the foreigners. It would seem best that there should be a business corporation distinct from the legislative supervisory organization, and that it also might as well be created by Congress. The stock of that would be held chiefly in the locality of the exhibition. In the probable case now before us, citizens of New York would conduct that organization. Managed purely as a speculative, money-making affair, it would desire, perhaps, to follow the example of other speculative organizations—charge exhibitors for the space they took, and not only sell concessions and exact royalties, but permit encysted exhibitions within the area of the main exhibition, like the familiar "side-shows" of the circus, and take toll of them. The Centennial Exhibition did nothing of the kind. For the fifty cents paid at the gate the citizen was entitled to see all within the walls. Whatever space could be spared to an exhibitor he occupied without fee or toll. Sales were taxed and concessions sold, but there was no involuntary taxation of the admitted public.

That these just regulations might be carried out, and because the work will be a national benefit, it would be equitable that the national government should contribute a reasonable, but generous, sum. It is quite possible to devise a wise method of national protection, regulation, and assistance, by a small national commission, with popular support and investment and chiefly local administration.

A reasonable time having elapsed since the previous exhibition, and the requisite local enthusiasm, capital, energy, and patriotism being apparently ready, every man who has studied these great enterprises will give this his hearty good-will. It will promote harmony and fraternity among our own States; it will stimulate progress in the sciences and arts that benefit mankind; it will invite trade, and strengthen the bonds of peace and amity among nations.

Dr. Whewell entitles the first English exhibition "The University of 1851." Humboldt said: "Those states which take no part in the general industrial movement will infallibly see their prosperity diminish." Secretary Seward said: "From the commencement of the industrial epoch of 1851, the profound significance and value of such exhibitions have been realized by the people and governments of the civilized nations. Their beneficent influences are many and widespread. They advance human knowledge in all directions. Through the universal language of the products of labor, the artisans of all countries hold communication; ancient prejudices are broken down; nations are fraternized; generous rivalries in the peaceful fields of industry are excited; the tendencies to war are lessened, and a better understanding between labor and capital is fostered." And Mr. Whittier sang in 1876:

"Thou who hast here in concord furled
The war flags of a gathered world,
Beneath our Western skies fulfil
The Orient's mission of good-will,
And, freighted with Love's golden fleece,
Send back the Argonauts of peace.

"Oh! make Thou us, through centuries long,
In peace secure, and justice strong;
Around our gift of freedom draw
The safeguards of Thy righteous law,
And, cast in some diviner mould,
Let the new cycle shame the old!"

J. R. HAWLEY.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BY ELECTRICITY.

BY ELBRIDGE T. GERRY.

THE PENALTY of death for the commission of crime had its origin in the mandate uttered by the Creator after the world had witnessed the first murder. The divine authority to terminate human life for the illegal shedding of blood, enlarged by the subsequent enunciation of the law from Mount Sinai in its application to other offences, appears to have been exercised ever since by every nation on the earth, barbarous as well as civilized, in some form or other, in punishment of offences more or less heinous in their character. Under the Mosaic code there were no less than thirty-three capital crimes, and the mode of execution, that by stoning to death, made the people themselves the instruments for its infliction. For a long period human ingenuity exhausted itself in efforts to devise means of death by which the latter should only be the final result of prolonged physical pain and agony. The vengeance of the law, as it was popularly termed, was sought to be made as terrible as possible, first in retaliation for the crime committed, and, secondly, in order to produce, by the horrible tortures which it inflicted, a deterrent effect, in the language of the old law-books, on other evilly-minded persons disposed in like manner to offend. The sickening details still preserved of executions by impalement, sawing asunder, boiling, burning, and flaying alive, crushing by weights, breaking on the wheel, tearing asunder by wild horses, and the like, create a doubt in the mind of the student of history, especially of the law, whether such punishments, so far from deterring, did not both suggest and stimulate the commission of the very crimes they were designed to prevent.

Certainly the multiplication of capital offences in England had the result of increasing their commission, and later, as civilization advanced and the subject became more carefully studied, fewer

crimes were made capital and less formidable methods of inflicting the death penalty were adopted. The deprivation of life is now almost universally regarded as a full and complete satisfaction of what is commonly styled the outraged majesty of the law, and the methods employed to-day are undoubtedly intended to deprive the criminal of his life without subjecting him to additional physical pain or suffering as a prelude to that result. The spirit of humanity which everywhere asserts itself as civilization advances has, in other words, decreed that some mercy shall be shown even the vilest convict in depriving him of life, and that the means employed to accomplish that end shall be as rapid and painless as possible. For the average criminal dreads death itself far more than the mode of its infliction. Its ignominy is seldom thought of. Loss of life signifies to him a permanent deprivation of every pleasure, and this, coupled with a lively dread of the terrors of the world to come, overshadows the fear of the machinery of the law which accomplishes the result. Up to the last moment condemned criminals often brace themselves to apparent stoicism; but at the fatal instant few fail to show evidences of the terror with which they meet their doom. Hence any prolongation of the death agony, either as a deterrent or as a part of the punishment, is alike unnecessary and cruel. The mental anguish far exceeds the physical pain.

Modern Europe has practically reduced the modes of inflicting the death penalty, so far as the criminal law is concerned, to beheading and strangulation—beheading, by the sword and guillotine; strangulation, by the garrote and hanging. Beheading is a method of execution alike certain and instantaneous, but it is necessarily followed by the effusion of blood, and is open to many objections unnecessary here to enumerate. Strangulation by the garrote, accompanied as it is by the simultaneous crushing of the spinal column at the neck, while certain and instantaneous, is only resorted to in Spain and her colonies, and produces a ghastly mutilation of the body. Strangulation by hanging has been practised in England and this country for very many years, our colonies having inherited it from the mother-country as the recognized form of capital execution. The sentence is that the convict be hanged by the neck until he is dead. But careful examination of this mode of execution satisfied a commission appointed by the Legislature of the State of New York in 1886 to

consider the subject that the time and mode of death by this method were alike uncertain and dependent partly on the nerve of the convict and partly on the skill of the executioner ; that in some cases the neck was broken by a sudden jerk, and in others protracted agonies of strangulation ensued ; and that there was no certainty in any case of either result following the cutting loose of the weight or the fall of the drop.

To render this more intelligible the following description will suffice : The convict is placed under a frame, in the centre of which hangs a rope carried over pulleys to an adjoining apartment. There the end of the rope is attached to a mass of metal double the actual weight of the convict's body, and suspended some four or five feet from the ground by a guard rope ready to be severed at the instant of the execution. Then a running noose through an enormous knot of the size of the fist is adjusted around the neck of the convict so that the knot comes under the left ear. The end of the noose rope running through the knot is attached by a snap hook to the rope on the frame, the guard rope is cut on signal given, the metal weight falls, and the convict is suddenly and violently jerked into the air. Now, if the knot is accurately adjusted, and the man stands motionless, this sudden jerk dislocates the spinal column at the neck and death is instantaneous. He dies, in other words, from a broken neck. But if the knot is not exactly in the right place, if the convict, through accident, fear, or attempted resistance, turns his head, or the knot changes its position, then death by slow strangulation ensues, the struggles lasting from eighteen to twenty minutes and being horrible to witness. Where a drop through a platform is substituted for the frame, weight, and pulleys, the result is the same—a notable illustration of it ocurring in the execution of the Chicago Anarchists in 1887.

As recently as July 31, 1889, two men, Henry Smart and Charles Dilger, were hanged in Louisville, Kentucky, for murder. The knot was properly adjusted in Smart's case, and his death was sudden and instantaneous. Not so with Dilger. At the time of drop the end of the rope forming the noose was seen to unravel, and the noose refused to tighten. The knot so far untied as to be held in its place only by a single coil, and the rope was caught directly under the point of the man's chin. It was obvious to any spectator that death would

not result inside of several hours unless something were done, and the struggling attempts of the unfortunate man to breathe could be heard distinctly over the entire yard. An eye-witness of the horrible sight describes the noise as sharp and rasping—so peculiar as to render it impossible of description. Finally two of the officers lifted the body, and another rope was quickly made fast to the cross-beam overhead. Dilger was dazed, and muttered incoherently. At the second drop the new rope also seemed reluctant, and the knot slipped around to the back of Dilger's neck. The noose tightened, however, and *after twenty-four minutes, during which the body writhed and twisted,* Dilger was pronounced dead! In addition to this the numerous recorded cases of broken ropes, decapitation by the use of too small a noose cord, prolonged suffering from peculiar physical development of the neck, as also some authentic cases of subsequent resuscitation, demonstrate very plainly the propriety of substituting, if practicable, some means of inflicting the death penalty which shall be painless, instantaneous, and uniform in its results.

Of all the potent forces capable of producing death, there is none known to science more nearly instantaneous than electricity. In the ordinary occurrence in nature, where a person struck by lightning falls dead, nothing can be more sudden or rapid. And where—to give what has already proved to be a practical and fatal illustration—electricity is generated artificially for illuminating purposes, the interruption of the current by the intervention of or contact with any portion of the human body is invariably followed by the most serious consequences to the latter. Over ninety cases of accidental death by such contacts during the past two years are recorded, and in every case the action of the current was so instantaneous as to leave not the shadow of a doubt that death was literally quicker than thought. The body was not mutilated; there were no indications of any death-struggle; none of physical pain. The Constitution of the State of New York (Article I., § 5) wisely prohibits the infliction of "cruel *and* unusual punishments." Hanging, for the reasons shown, while not unusual, may be, and too often is, cruel. Electricity, on the other hand, while not yet usual, has yet to be proven to be cruel; and as death whenever produced by it has been instantaneous, it is difficult to see how it can be shown to be cruel. That burns and injuries do result from contact with the electric current does

not disprove its instantaneous lethal power. It might as well be argued that a deadly drug like strychnia is harmless because a slight dose is productive of only unpleasant results. Even electricity in a mild form is a valuable medical agent.

It is neither the purpose nor intention of the writer of this article to discuss or examine the special methods by which the electrical current may or should be utilized in its application to insure death. The Legislature of this State in 1888 amended its Code of Criminal Procedure by substituting for the death penalty of hanging the "causing to pass through the body of the convict a current of electricity of sufficient intensity to cause death, and the application of such current must be continued until such convict is dead." The selection of the apparatus for the purpose is wisely entrusted by law to the superintendent of State-prisons. What particular kind of current or *electrolethe*—to coin a word expressive of the apparatus—is the most efficacious is a question properly within his province to determine, and comes within the sphere of the skilful practical electricians selected by him to provide the same. But that a current of electricity of sufficient intensity, purposely and directly applied to the human body, will certainly and instantaneously destroy life, is demonstrated by the ninety cases of accidental death by electricity where no such application was intended; where, on the contrary, the current was generated and guarded as far as practicable for a different purpose, but where the death could not be ascribed to any other cause. That a number of other persons may have escaped with severe injuries at other times and under other circumstances simply argues an imperfect contact with the current. But to contend that a proper *electrolethe* cannot be constructed, certain in its effects, when such fatal accidental results from an ordinary arc-light dynamo, intended only for illuminating purposes, are proven beyond dispute, is simply to argue an absurdity.

ELBRIDGE T. GERRY.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF PARIS.

BY FREDERIC HARRISON.

No city of the Old World has undergone changes so enormous within the last hundred years as the city of Paris. To contrast its condition down to the year 1789 with its condition to-day is to measure the civilization of old Europe by the civilization of the Europe we see. Paris in 1789 was a perfect type of the feudal, monarchic, obsolete system of privilege; the Paris of 1889 is the most republican, the most modern, the most symmetrical and complete of the cities of Europe. The hundred years have witnessed there a reorganization of social life more rapid and profound than any other which Europe has known.

If the millions who throng the boulevards, and the *Places*, the *Champ de Mars*, and the *Esplanade* of the *Invalides* could but roll back the mighty veil of time, could see that city as it stood in the closing years of the eighteenth century, they would behold a city which in all essential things was a fortress of the Middle Ages, adorned with some vast palaces and churches of the *Grand Monarque*—a city, in the main, such as Rome was until the Italian kingdom had entered and transformed it. They would see the life of the seventeenth century, in most material points, unaltered—nay, traces of the life of the sixteenth, the fifteenth, and even of the fourteenth century.

The vast, gloomy, and decayed walls of the old city still cumbered the lines of so many gay and open boulevards. Where there are now some twenty bridges across the Seine, there were then but six or seven; and on some of these could still be seen the houses and buildings which made the bridges of old Europe crowded alleys. There were few open spaces at all except in front of the *Hôtel de Ville* and at the end of the garden of the *Tuileries*. The old city of Richelieu and Mazarin—the city (to speak roughly) that lay between the *Panthéon* and the gate of *St. Denis*, and between the *Tuileries* and the *Bastille*—existed still,

and much in the condition in which Richelieu and Mazarin had known it,—crowded with narrow, crooked, picturesque streets, unpaved, uncleaned, ill-lighted, with Gothic portals and towers here and there; crowded round with houses, halls, and mansions. The island, or old *Cité*, in particular, was a dense tangle of streets, churches, and religious edifices. From north to south there ran several ancient and a few recent thoroughfares; but from east to west he who wished to pass from the *Bastille* to the *Louvre* would make his way through a net-work of tortuous lanes, where the direct route was continually interrupted by huge palaces, mediæval fortresses, or conventual enclosures.

Four great castles of feudal times still frowned over the city and bore the banner of the Old Monarchy—the *Châtelet*, the *Bastille*, the *Temple*, and the *Conciergerie*. Of these not a vestige remains except the restored simulacrum of the last. In the midst of this jumble of close and mediæval streets there were scattered many sumptuous Palladian palaces of royal, princely, or ducal founders, with fore-courts, colonnades, terraces, and enclosed gardens, stretching over acres, and dominating entire quarters in defiant, lavish, insolent pride. Here and there still towered above the modern streets a huge remnant of some castle of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, such as we may see to this day in Florence, Verona, or Rome.

And, besides these castles and palaces, the closely-packed streets were even more thickly strewn with churches, convents, and abbeys. *Notre-Dame*, *St. Eustache*, *St. Germain l'Auxerrois*, the *Hôtel de Ville*, the *Louvre*, the *Palais Royal*, and the *Palais de Justice* were hemmed in with a labyrinth of old and entangled streets. Buildings, alleys, and even churches separated the *Louvre* from the *Tuileries*, *Notre-Dame* from the *Palais de Justice*, cut off *Notre-Dame* and the *Hôtel de Ville* from the river, stood between *Palais Royal* and *Louvre*, and between the *Panthéon* and the garden of the *Luxembourg*. Where the graceful fountain of Victory now brightens one of the gayest spots in Paris, the *Place du Châtelet*, bordered with two immense theatres, colonnades, gardens, and trees, there were then the decayed remnant of the great royal fortress and a net-work of crooked and unsightly lanes.

Besides the churches, chapels, hospitals, palaces, and castles, there also stood within the circuit of the city more than two

hundred religious houses for both sexes; abbeys, convents, nunneries and fraternities; peopled with thousands of men and women, leading separate lives, under different vows, owning obedience to far-distant superiors, and possessing various immunities. The vast areas occupied by the abbeys of *St. Germain*, of *St. Martin*, of *St. Victor*, by the houses of the *Bernardins*, and the *Célestins*, and the *Quinze-Vingts*, were a sensible portion of the whole area within the walls. From the then new *Place Louis XV.* to the *Bastille*, from the *Luxembourg* garden to the *Porte St. Denis*, Paris was a great fortified city of the Middle Ages, crammed with thousands of sacred buildings, Catholic and feudal institutions, and thickly studded with Italian palaces, colleges, hospitals, and offices in the proud and lavish style of Louis the Fourteenth. Poverty, squalor, uncleanness, and vice jostled the magnificence of Princes and the mouldering creations of the ages of Faith.

The difference between the Paris of 1789 and the Paris of 1889 is enormous; but it is very far from true that the whole difference is gain. Much has been gained in convenience, health, brilliance: much has been lost in beauty, variety, and historical tradition. To the uncultured votary of amusement the whole of the change represents progress: to the artist, the antiquarian, and the sentimentalist it represents havoc, waste, and bad taste. It would be well if the tens of thousands who delight in the boulevards, gardens, and sunny bridges of to-day would now and then cast a thought upon the priceless works of art, the historical remains, and the picturesque charm which the new Paris has swept away. Churches and towers, encrusted sculptures of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, rare, inimitable, irrecoverable wonders of skill and feeling, have been swallowed up wholesale in the modern "improvements." Sixteen churches have disappeared from the *Cité* alone: four of them and ten streets have been carted away to make the site of a single hospital. Where is the abbey of *St. Victor*, of *St. Germain*, of *Ste. Geneviève*, and the *Cour des Comptes*, and the churches of *St. André*, *St. Jacques de la Boucherie*, *Saints Innocents*, *St. Jean*, and *St. Paul*? Where are the turrets of Saint Louis, and Etienne Marcel, and Philip the Fair? Where are the quaint passages and fantastic gables preserved for us only by Meryon, Gavarni, and Gustave Doré?

It would be idle to regret the inevitable—more especially

when the inevitable means the rebuilding and laying-out of the most brilliant, most spacious, most symmetrical of modern cities. For us it is enough that, down to the Revolution of 1789, Paris was an intensely old-world city; and that to-day it is the type of the modern city. In the eighteenth century London had lost every trace of the fortress, of the feudal city, of subservience to king, aristocracy, or church. It had neither ramparts, nor traces of rampart, nor convents, nor proud palaces, nor royal castles in its midst. The Reformation had swept away the monasteries, the aristocracy were more than half *bourgeois* (at least whilst they lived in London), and the King was a popular country squire, who, in things essential, was governed by a liberal Parliament. The Tower was a popular show; the Mayor and Corporation were a powerful, free, and public-spirited body; the capital was being extended and beautified in the interest of those who lived in it; and, in all its main lines, the city of London was much what it is to-day. It was about one-third more populous than Paris, better paved, better lit, with a better supply of water and means of communication, and with a far superior system of administration. It was practically a modern city, even then: it was the current type of the modern city, and was regarded by all as a far more agreeable, more civilized, more splendid city than Paris. It was natural enough that, when the liberal nobles and wits of France began to visit England (as in the eighteenth century they universally did), an Anglo-mania resulted—which was one of the main causes of the Revolution.

Some of the great ornaments of Paris existed complete in 1789, but they were encumbered with narrow streets and cut off from each other. The *Louvre*, the *Tuileries*, the *Palais Royal* existed much as we have seen them, but they were all divided from each other by blocks of buildings and intricate lanes. The *Palais de Justice*, the remains of the palace of St. Louis, and *Notre-Dame* were there, but were blocked up by modern buildings. Portions of the *Luxembourg* and of the *Hôtel de Ville* were standing. The *Invalides*, the *École Militaire*, stood as we know them; the *Place de la Concorde* (then *Place de Louis XV.*) was already laid out, and the two great offices flanking the *Rue Royale* were already built.

On the other hand, the bridge now called *de la Concorde* was not open, nor was it bounded by the Hall of the *Corps Législatif*:

there was no *Arc de l'Étoile,* no *Madeleine,* no Column of *Vendôme,* no *Place de l'Opéra, du Châtelet,* or *de la Bastille.* The *Place du Carrousel* was blocked by buildings, and the *Rue de Rivoli,* the *Rue de la Paix,* did not exist. The *Panthéon* was not quite finished; the *Louvre* was not continued on the northern side; the site of the *Halles* was a net-work of streets; cemeteries and charnel-houses existed within the city; the quays were irregular and rude structures; the bridges were picturesque edifices of four or five different centuries, and only one-third of their present number; there were no pavements for foot-passengers, no cleansing of the streets, whilst open sewers met one at every turn. Paris in 1789 was much what Rome was in 1860—a huge, ancient, fortified city, filled with dense, squalid, populous districts, interspersed with vast open tracts in the hands of powerful nobles or great monasteries, and the whole perpetually dominated by a bigoted, selfish, and indifferent absolutism.

The population of Paris in 1789, according to the latest and best authorities, was about 640,000 : in 1889 it is 2,240,000. It has thus increased exactly three and one-half times. There is nothing abnormal in this. London in the same time has doubled quite four times, and a similar rate of increase has been seen in Berlin, Vienna, St. Petersburg, Lyons, Marseilles, and Rouen. The increase of many English centres of industry, and of nearly all the American, has been vastly greater and more rapid. Still, the increase of Paris, within a hundred years, of three or four times in population and five or six times in area, is a sufficiently striking fact. In 1789 there were about one thousand streets : there are now about four thousand. There were fifteen boulevards : there are now more than one hundred. The *Invalides,* the *Luxembourg,* the *Bastille,* the line of the inner boulevards, and the *Place Vendôme* then marked the utmost limits of regular habitations; and thence the open country began. There were within the barriers immense spaces, gardens, and parks; but they were closed to the public. Paris, which is now covered with gardens, parks, plantations, and open spaces, was in 1789 singularly bare of any. The *Jardin des Plantes,* the *Jardin des Tuileries,* were royal possessions; the *Champs Elysées* and the *Palais Royal* were favorite walks. But these were almost the only accessible promenades. Of some forty *places* of importance which Paris now possesses, few existed in 1789, except the *Place de la Concorde,* the *Esplanade* of the *In-*

valides, the *Champ de Mars*, the *Place Vendôme*, and the *Place Royale* (now *des Vosges*). Within the circuit of the older city there was hardly a clear space, a plantation, a parterre, or a free walk, except in the *Parvis de Notre-Dame*, the *Marché des Innocents*, and the *Place de la Grève*. From the *Louvre* to the *Hôtel de Ville* there lay a labyrinth of dark and tortuous lanes, such as we may still see in the *Ghetto* of Rome or round about the Canongate at Edinburgh.

The change that has taken place is that of a dream, or a transformation in a theatre. The Revolution came, the Convention, the first Empire, the Orleans monarchy, and the third Empire—and all is new. Streets only too symmetrical, straight, and long; open spaces at the junction of all the principal streets, boulevards, avenues, gardens, fountains, have sprung by magic into the places so lately covered with labyrinthine alleys. As we stand to-day in the *Place du Carrousel*, in the *Place de l'Opéra, du Théâtre Français, du Châtelet, de la Bastille, des Innocents, St. Michel, St. Germain, Notre-Dame*, or *de l'Hôtel de Ville*, each radiant with imposing buildings, stately avenues, monuments, fountains, columns, and colonnades, with everything that modern architecture can devise of spacious, airy, and gay, it is hard indeed to understand how in so few years (and much of it within the memory of men still living) all this has been created over the ruins of the dense, dark, intricate streets of the last century, where lanes still followed the ramparts of Louis the Fat and Philip Augustus, where the remnants existed of *châteaux* built by mediæval seigneurs, or during the civil wars of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

The clearance has been most cruel of all in the old *Cité*, the original Paris of the earliest ages. Down to the Revolution it had a population of about 20,000, which has now almost wholly disappeared, along with the sixteen churches and the scores of streets. The ancient island—*Lutetia*—is now occupied almost solely by six enormous public buildings; and the spot, which for eighteen centuries has been busy with the hum of a city life of intense activity and movement, is now covered only by a lonely but glorious cathedral, an enormous hospital, a huge barrack, courts, offices, and official buildings. The oldest bit of Paris, the oldest bit of city in all northern Europe, now looks for the most part like a new quarter laid out on some vacant space. *Notre-Dame*, the *Sainte Chapelle*, the *Conciergerie*, have been restored and fur-

bished up till they almost might pass for modern buildings. The barrack, the hospital, the geometric streets, the open square, might do credit to Chicago. It is all very fine, imposing, spacious, and new. But a groan may be forgiven to those who can remember the mystic portals of *Notre-Dame* with the gallery of the kings, surrounded with houses which seemed to lean upon the mother-church for comfort and support, before the restorer had worked his will upon the crumbling, dark, pathetic fragments of carving, whilst the noblest façade ever raised by northern Gothic builders still looked like a great mediæval church, and not like an *objet d'art* to be gazed at in a museum.

This transformation, the most astounding that Europe can show, fills us ever anew with a profound sense of the power which for a century has animated the municipal government at Paris; of the energy, wealth, industrial skill, artistic imagination, and scientific accomplishments which have gone to the making of it. To plough miles and miles of broad new boulevards through the most crowded lines of an ancient, populous, and busy city; to transform a net-work of *Ghettos* into a splendid series of avenues, squares, and gardens; to eviscerate the heart of a great capital, and to create symmetry, sunniness, convenience, gayety, and variety out of inveterate confusion, gloom, discomfort, and squalor—this impresses the mind with the visible signs of imperial might in the ruler, and inexhaustible versatility and adaptability in the governed.

It is a different thing when a Frederick plans a new city in Berlin, or when a Republic creates itself a capital in Washington. But in Paris the capital existed; with eighteen centuries of history, with monarchic, feudal, ecclesiastical, municipal institutions by the thousand, rooted for ages in the soil, and buttressed by long epochs of prescription, privilege, law, and superstition. Not for an hour has the capital ceased to be the living heart of France; not for a day has its own activity been interrupted, or the lives of some million or so of citizens been broken. Republic, Consulate, Empire, Monarchy, have succeeded each other in turn. Revolutions, sieges, massacres, anarchy, tyranny, parliaments, dictators, and communes have in turn had their seat in Paris, and have occupied her streets, buildings, and monuments. But under all, the transformation of old Paris into new Paris has gone on. *Bastille, Châtelet, Temple, Tuileries,* have been swept away: enormous boulevards and avenues have torn their huge gaps like

cannon-shot through ancient quarters : abbeys, churches, palaces, hospitals, convents, gardens, halls, and theatres have disappeared like unsubstantial visions, and have left not a rack behind. As the vacant spaces are cleared, new streets, theatres, halls, and squares spring up. A thousand new fancies and hundreds of new monuments take their place with inexhaustible invention. The city grows more populous, more rich, more brilliant year by year. The busy life which is silenced in the *Cité*, or by the new boulevards, avenues, and *places*, bursts forth with a louder din elsewhere. Every creation of artistic imagination, every invention of science, is instantly brought into service and adapted to modern life. And with all this whirl of change and action, Paris remains in its essence an ancient, and not a modern, city ; a very ancient city to him who knows its history, and can recall the memorials of its past. To this day, such an one can retrace her ten successive circuits, her ramparts and barriers of successive dynasties ; he can track out the spots made memorable by Julian, by Clovis, by Philip Augustus, by Francis I. and Henry IV., by Abailard, and Héloise, and Jeanne Darc, by Dante and Descartes, by Corneille. Some two hundred streets still bear the names of saints, each recalling some convent of the Merovingian, Carlovingian, or Capetian dynasty, some one of the thousands of churches, chapels, oratories, and religious houses which once filled Paris. To the historical mind, the *St. Germains*, the *St. Thomases*, the *St. Andrés*, the *St. Martins*, the *St. Victors*, the *St. Bernards*, which we read inscribed at the street corner, recall a series of local memorials which reach back for a thousand years. Here St. Louis stood and prayed ; here the Grand Master of the Templars was burned ; here Jeanne Darc fell desperately wounded; here Molière died ; here Corneille lived ; here Coligny was murdered ; here Henry IV. was stabbed ; here Voltaire died, and here Camille Desmoulins opened the Revolution.

Here, as everywhere in human life, we must take the evil with the good. It is idle, peevish, retrograde, to rail at the inevitable, or to cry out for the past. There has been awful, wanton, brutal destruction ; there have been corruption and plunder ; there has been vile art, making itself the pandar to folly and lust ; there have been cruel disregard of the poor and inhuman orgies of wealth and power, in all this series of transformation scenes which Paris has seen. No man can again recall to us the exquisite fan-

cies carved on stone and on jewelled windows of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Perhaps it was better to cart them away than to furbish them anew with gewgaw restorations. But modern life in a vast city could not endure this plethora of obsolete churches and useless convents in its midst, and the friars, black, white, and gray, had to go with all their belongings. Dark alleys are delicious in etchings; but they are the nests of disease, vice, and death. A city of two millions cannot breathe within the winding lanes which sufficed the burghers of the fourteenth century within their gloomy ramparts. Haussmann and his myrmidons may have amassed fortunes; but the world is still searching, lantern in hand like Diogenes, for a wise, just, incorruptible municipal authority. The art which has created modern Paris is not high art, is not true art, is in many ways most meretricious art; and in its *chef d'œuvre*, the new Opera, it has reached the pinnacle of vulgar display. But, take it all and all, Paris can show us the brightest, most inventive, and least *mesquin* street architecture which the nineteenth century can achieve, and certainly the most imperial civic organization which Europe can produce.

There is much to be said on all sides of this complex problem; the catholic, the legitimist, the republican, the antiquarian, the artist, the poet, the socialist, the economist, even the tourist, may be listened to with sympathy in turn. Let us gnash our teeth at the tale told us by the student of old art; let us drop a tear over the wail of the dispossessed orders; let us linger over every fragment of the past which the historian can point out as spared in the havoc; let us listen to the story of the dispossessed workman; let us study the statistics of the old and the new city; let us stroll with the *flâneur* on the boulevards; but let us not say that it is either altogether evil or altogether good. Modern Paris is the creation of the Revolution of 1789, and, like most of the creations of that mighty and pregnant epoch, it has the soul of good in things evil; deplorable waste and error in the midst of inevitable and indispensable reform.

A city is made to live in. Now, a serious defect in old Paris was that it was a city in which men died. Down to the Revolution of 1789, the annual deaths exceeded the annual births. Since the Revolution the births exceed the deaths. The birth-rate in Paris is low, and the death-rate is high, as compared with that of London and English towns to-day; but the birth-rate of Paris is

now much in excess of the death-rate. The death-rate of modern Paris is little more than twice the actual death-rate of 1789, though the population is now nearly four times as great. The death-rate of old Paris was far higher than that of any actual city of western Europe, and for a parallel to it we must now go to the cities of the East. The death-rate of Paris is still high, for it is largely increased by the almost deliberate destruction of infant life. But before the Revolution, we must take it that some three or four thousand lives were annually sacrificed to insanitary conditions. The sanitary condition of Paris in the middle of the last century was, indeed, that of Cairo or Constantinople. Drinking-water taken direct from the Seine, open sewers, cemeteries, and charnel-houses in the heart of the city, infected and squalid lanes, dirt, decay, and disorder made life precarious and scattered disease wholesale. The marvel is that pestilence was ever absent.

This was no accident; nor was it due to apathy or ignorance in the people of Paris. It was a direct result of the *Old Régime*—the deliberate act of the Monarchy, the Church, and the Nobility. Its causes were political. Paris presented in herself an epitome of all the vices, follies, inhumanities, and solecisms of the Old System. Everything in it that was effete, barbarous, injurious to modern civilization; all that prerogative, privilege, superstition, and caste could do to crush a great capital, was done. No consideration of the health, comfort, or needs of the great city affected Louis XIV. or Louis XV. They and their courts lived at Versailles, given up to ambition, display, or vice. Paris and the Parisians existed to produce fine things, to give splendor to the monarchy, society to the nobility, fat benefices to the church. The meanest fraternity of friars, the most scandalous abbé, the most rapacious courtier, was of more account than the corporate officials of Paris. Vested interests, sacred foundations, privileged rights, blocked every path to reform and progress. The king's palaces, the king's fortresses, the king's institutions were inviolable, sacred, immutable. An obsolete foundation of by-gone superstition was the cause of God. And the caprice of a great noble was a high matter of state.

Old Paris consisted of dark and crooked lanes, because in the Middle Ages cities were so built. To build new streets, to plan fresh thoroughfares, would disturb some church, destroy some oratory, inconvenience some marquis, or displace some convent.

To pave streets, to make sewers, to open spaces, to remove cemeteries, to supply pure water, and to obtain fresh air would cost money, would affect privileges or invade some right. But the money of Parisians was required to pay the king's dues, not to improve Paris. All privileges were above the law, and as sacred as the Ark of the Covenant. "Rights," in the sense of privileges, came before law, before necessity, before humanity, decency, or public duty. The *salus populi* was the *infima lex*—the lowest and last consideration which authority recognized. Prescription and the will of an absolute despot—these were the sole standards of public convenience. And the result was that they made permanent and astounding accretion of public inconvenience. Something was done by Louis XIV. to add magnificence to the capital by some royal palaces, churches, and boulevards; and early in the reign of Louis XV. the spirit of social improvement, which culminated in the States-General of 1789, began to make itself felt. A few improvements were made, new streets were built on the outskirts, the cemeteries were closed, and the water-supply was reformed. From the middle of the century a series of efforts were made, and not the least by Turgot and by his father, the Provost. But before privilege and prerogative the best efforts failed. It needed a revolution to reform the city of Paris. And the Revolution has not only reformed, but transformed it with a vengence.

The physical disorder of old Paris was merely the reflection—indeed, but a pale reflection—of the social, political, moral disorder of the *Old Régime.* The organization of the city was a chaos of competing authorities, a tangle of obsolete privileges, and a nest of scandalous abuses. Anomalous courts jostled and scrambled for jurisdiction; ancient guilds and corporations blocked every reform; atrocious injustice and inveterate corruption reigned high-handed in the name of king, noble, or church. A valuable work of great research has just appeared (June, 1889), under the direction of an important commission of historians, which throws new light from public documents on the condition of Paris under the old system.* We may see in it an astounding picture of misrule. The *Parlement,* the *Hôtel de Ville,* the *Châtelet,* the Governor of Paris, the Governor of the *Bastille,* the

* *L'État de Paris en 1789.* Études et Documents sur l'Ancien Régime à Paris. H. Monin. Paris. Jouast, etc., etc., 1889.

Minister of Paris, the University, the trade-guilds, the church, the religious foundations, all claim privileges, jurisdictions, rights, immunities, which cross and re-cross each other in continual conflict.

There was no real municipality, no true elective representation of the citizens. Certain officials, named by the Crown, professed to speak and to act in the name of the city. Civil and criminal justice was shared by various bodies under quite indefinite authority. The *Châtelet* absorbed in the seventeenth century no less than nineteen baronial jurisdictions; but the Archbishopric and several abbeys retained their own distinct courts. The *Châtelet*, the *Hôtel de Ville*, the church, each divided Paris into distinct sets of local subdivisions. Taxation, public works, justice, police, markets, public health, even hospitals and charities, were under the control of different authorities, with no defined limits. Interminable disputes between the different authorities ensued. Of the streets, one in ten was a *cul-de-sac*. Although the area of Paris is now six or seven times greater than it was before the Revolution, and though the population is nearly four times as great, there are little more than twice as many houses. There were 30,000 beggars in Paris. Down to 1779 the ancient foundation of St. Louis, the *Quinze-Vingts*, held an immense area between the *Louvre* and the *Palais Royal*, blocking up both, as well as the *Rue St. Honoré* and the *Rue Richelieu*. This enclosure, which was a privileged asylum, contained a population of from five to six thousand, not only licensed to beg, but bound to live by begging. It was not until 1786 that the cemetery and charnel-house of the *Saints Innocents* was suppressed. It is hardly credible that little more than a hundred years have passed since, in the densest quarter of Paris, long colonnades of grinning sculls and festering burying-grounds were standing where now we have the lovely fountain of Lescot and Gonjon, transformed indeed, and almost more lovely in its transformation, in the centre of the bright and glowing square that recalls Verona or Genoa.

The censorship of all writings "contrary to law, to the catholic faith, to public morals, or judicial prerogative," opened a wide door for arbitrary power. In the years immediately preceding the Revolution, the *Parlement* of Paris suppressed sixty-five works. One of these is condemned as tending "*à soulever les esprits.*" Another is condemned as a libel on Cagliostro! Sunday labor, eating meat in Lent, neglecting to dress the house-

front on a religious procession, playing hazard, "speaking so as to alarm the public," are some of the grounds of a criminal sentence. The most revolting public executions were common in all parts of the city. As if to accustom all to the sight of cruel punishments, some fifty places are recorded as the scenes of these horrible public exposures. The sentence sets out the details of these executions in all their hideous particulars. *Ledit* so-and-so shall be taken to *Notre-Dame*, where his hand shall be chopped off, then taken on a cart to another place, where he shall be broken alive on a wheel, and so left "as long as it shall please God to prolong his life"; then his body shall be burned and the ashes scattered to the winds. A workingman, for stealing some linen, is condemned to be hung on a gibbet and strangled by the public executioner. It was not till 1780 that preliminary torture of an accused person was abolished: torture as part of the sentence was retained till the Revolution. The personal punishments included the pillory, branding, flogging, maiming, strangling, breaking alive, and burning. This is how the ancient Monarchy prepared the people for the guillotine.

The Revolution has swept away all this, and new Paris has sprung to life out of the Revolution, like Athene from the head of the Thunderer. Out of extreme confusion, symmetry; out of ancient privilege, absolute democracy; out of paralysis of rival authorities, intense concentration of authority; out of squalor, splendor; out of barbar. , the latest devices of civilization. Yet, for all these changes, Paris is not Chicago or Washington; it is no fine new city built on an open plain. Her nineteen centuries of history are still there; the gay boulevards stand on the foundationstones of a thousand structures of the past; the placards on each omnibus recall the names of mighty centres of faith, wisdom, devotion, purity, love. The religious passion, the civic ardor, the republican zeal, the wit, the science, the electric will, the social ideals, the devotion to ideas,—are all there as of old. In a deeper sense, "nothing is changed," as Louis XVIII. said on his return, "except that there is another [million or so] of Frenchmen more." And as the traveller passes up and down his Paris of to-day, let us say to him:

> "Periculosæ plenum opus aleæ
> Tractas; et incedis per ignes
> Suppositos cineri doloso."
>
> —*Horace: Odes.* II. 1, *lines* 6, 7, 8.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

ARE PUBLIC LIBRARIES PUBLIC BLESSINGS?

BY JAMES M. HUBBARD.

IT IS NOW scarcely forty years since the foundation of the first library owned by the people at large and intended for their use. Up to that time libraries had been either the property of shareholders or supported by subscriptions, or they were connected with societies and educational institutions, or, as in the case of the Astor Library, they were meant solely for students. This, however, was designed primarily to bring within the reach of the clerk, the mechanic, the laborer, all the treasures of literature. The experiment was so immediately successful that it was quickly tried in other places, and now public libraries are to be found in every part of the country.

It would surely be difficult to find, the world over, a more attractive picture, or one which represents in a material form more fully the height to which our civilization has reached, than one of those village greens on which stand side by side the church, the school, the library—that complete triad of the moral and intellectual forces of our age. Especially attractive is it when the library building is, as is not seldom the case, the town's chief architectural ornament, the memorial of some grateful son or honored citizen. Then, with an interior as winning as its exterior is beautiful, with the atmosphere of quiet and repose which the presence and companionship of books almost necessarily bring, even to the rudest, it is difficult to overestimate the refining and elevating influences which it may exert on the natures of many of those to whom its doors are freely opened.

In one respect the library enjoys a peculiar distinction as compared not only with the other two, but with all public institutions, so far as my knowledge goes. The church is more or less closely connected with the body of which it is a member, and consequently has no perfect freedom of action. The school is under the direct supervision of the State. The governing body of

the library alone is practically, in many cases absolutely, independent. In some instances, the town appropriates certain funds for the maintenance of a library and appoints the trustees and, occasionally, the librarian ; and here its power rests. In others, the trustees are a self-appointed, self-continuing body, the citizens having no voice in their selection. They may not even hold the purse, since there may be a permanent fund for the support of a library. In this case the trustees are irresponsible, there being no supreme authority, save public opinion, to whom they must render an account of the manner in which they exercise their powers, or to call them to account for a neglect of their duties.

The question naturally suggests itself in view of this fact, Is there any good and sufficient reason for this independence of control on the part of the directors of public libraries ? And further, Are there any real or possible dangers resulting from it, against which it would be well to guard ? In order to determine whether there is anything in the nature of their duties to justify the irresponsible position of these public officials, it is necessary to state briefly the object for which the public library is established. This is : to promote the education and elevation of the people, or, in other words, to make of it a People's High-School. That was the idea of the original founders. They had visions of young men and women whose circumstances had thrown them upon the world to seek a living in the store, the counting-house, the factory, and at the sewing-machine, with just education enough to awaken a thirst for knowledge ; and they determined that they would give them the means of satisfying this thirst. Who could tell, they thought, how many Arkwrights, Stephensons, Lawrences, or Lincolns there might be among these humble mechanics and clerks, whose powers would be lost to the world if knowledge of books were denied them ?

Not only this, but the library was to be the means of rescuing them from the dangers of the street, the saloon, the low amusements of the poor; to lift them above the sordid surroundings of their daily life. It is somewhat curious, considered in the light of after developments, that the Boston Public Library, and with it the whole public-library movement, owed its origin largely to the dread of the dangers of excessive novel-reading by the young. Joshua Bates, the London banker, whose munificent gifts made that institution a possibility, wrote that he did this in order to

"save those who, left to themselves, [would] waste their time in railroad literature, chiefly American novels. These publications are doing immense mischief."

The instruction, then, of the people was to be originally, and still ought to be, the chief object of the public library. And, it should be said in passing, in many places trustees, librarians, and school-teachers, especially, are earnestly striving to realize all that its various founders and benefactors have hoped from it. But to the education of the people it has from the first added the task of furnishing them with entertainment, and, at the same time, it threw open its doors to children. Naturally, they alone have availed themselves to the utmost of the privileges offered them, and naturally, too, they read almost exclusively the novels and story-books provided for them. Soon all other uses of the library were insignificant compared with this. From 70 to 80 per cent., and in some instances practically the whole, of the books circulated were fiction, read chiefly by the children. Notwithstanding the strenuous efforts for some years past of many having the charge of libraries in different places to counteract this tendency, it still remains the fact that about three-quarters of their circulation is of this character. That is, the libraries are in no true sense of the words educators of the people. They are the haunt, in every place, of a few scholars and persons of leisure, but their chief work is to furnish amusement for the young.

This fact alone, to my mind, very greatly diminishes the attractiveness of the picture, to which I have referred, of the beautiful building filled with the treasures of literature and thronged with eager readers. So far as the children are concerned, I am confident that, even if the novels at their command were the very best in the language, they would be far better off without them, and if dependent alone upon what their homes could afford for such recreation. But there are other facts which, when fairly and honestly considered, must make many seriously doubt whether the public libraries, as at present generally administered, are not a grave evil to the communities in which they are placed.

Forty years ago, many persons in New England and in the States settled by New-Englanders had a strong prejudice against all novel-reading, many holding it to be a downright sin. Others, more enlightened, did not go so far as this, but objected decidedly to the reading of novels by children. Still

others, again, permitted their children to read novels, but were very careful in their selection and strict in their prohibitions. "Jane Eyre," I distinctly remember, was a prohibited book in my youth, and Bulwer was a forbidden author, as were all French writers. But the standard of selection of books for the public libraries, if originally high, soon fell so low in many as to admit all novels above the very lowest grade. Where the funds were plentiful, as in the larger cities, practically everything above a dime-novel was purchased. The natural result of this indiscriminate buying was that tens, nay hundreds, of books which the best critics had pronounced profoundly immoral in their tendency and teaching found their way into the hands of children If protests were made,—and in some places they were continually made,—the ready answer on the part of trustees or librarians was that it was a people's library, and that what the public asked for should be supplied. Others urged that it was necessary to have books even of a poor character in order to attract readers who would read nothing else, and who, once brought from the dance-hall or the street-corner to frequent the library, would be educated up from the reading of the most sensational novel to the enjoyment of Scott and Shakespeare. It seems almost silly to refute this argument, and yet, urged as it was by some well-known writers, it probably still retains its specious force. For there is an element of truth in it which renders it fascinating to certain philanthropic, but illogical, persons.

To make this theory effective, the strictest control over the reading is absolutely necessary. The dime-novel, the sensational story, must be succeeded by one of a slightly higher grade, and if this process be rigidly carried out, possibly now and then a street-boy, if he possess exceptional abilities, may be brought to an intelligent appreciation of the classics of romance. But to imagine that this same result could be produced by giving such a lad the free range of a great collection of novels, good, bad, and indifferent, is simply the mark of ignorance of human nature. Not one in a hundred, under these circumstances, unaided and unrestrained, would go from the bad to the better and gradually thence to the highest walks of literature. And these persons wholly lost sight of the fact that, in attempting to rescue one street-boy by this means, they exposed a hundred other children to the danger of forming a taste for the lowest class of novels.

These, then, are the facts. Not only have the public libraries, as a whole, failed to reach their proper aim of giving the means of education to the people,—not necessarily, it should be said, through any fault of their guardians,—but they have gone aside from their true path to furnish amusement merely, and that in part of a pernicious character, chiefly to the young.

A few years ago this evil was far greater than it apparently is at present. Then so numerous were the works of notoriously immoral authors in our larger public libraries that many parents would no more permit their children to frequent them than they would allow them to go to a low theatre or a variety show. Public opinion at length became aroused, and there was a general reform. Many of these objectionable works were removed from the shelves of libraries in every part of the country. But doubtless the force of this outburst of public opinion has now spent itself, and this purifying work needs to be done over again. For one cannot take up a library catalogue without finding in it a score or more of books which no child should read.

The whole of the danger which a public library may be to the community to which it belongs has not yet been fully revealed. In some of the city libraries, and possibly in some of the town libraries,—but of this I have no certain knowledge,—there is a department, technically known by some as "The Inferno," in which books of unquestioned and undisguised immorality are kept. They are, I hasten to say, not all, probably only a very small proportion of them, of the "Decameron" type—immoral books, but still classics in spite of their character and for other reasons. They are to-day, more frequently, books noteworthy simply because of their wickedness, not because of any literary or historical merit—books just exactly as worthy of being preserved as pictures which are remarkable merely on account of their gross obscenity. The numbers of these books which are being produced mainly in Europe, both original works and the republications of works produced in a more depraved age, would probably astonish many of my readers. They are published chiefly, no doubt, to satisfy the prurient tastes of individuals; but the fact that libraries are also constant and certain purchasers must be an important factor in leading to their publication. Many a trustee, it can hardly be questioned, who would not dream of buying such books for his private library, and would shudder with horror if he saw them in

the hands of his daughters, purchases them for the public library under his charge without a qualm of conscience. And there they lie, a mass of corruption, having, probably in all cases, a very limited circulation; but still, one can be assured, they are not bought to be locked up from every eye—needing, like low-fever germs, but light and air to break into a moral pestilence.

From the existence of these two evils, the circulation of books among young people of a character especially injurious to them, and the gathering of collections of openly-immoral works,—evils for which there is, so far as I am aware, no direct remedy in the hands of the public,—I assert that the trustees of our public libraries should be held responsible to some more definite tribunal than that of public opinion. I might have mentioned other possible dangers, such as the power of the directors of any library to make it a propaganda of any delusive *ism* or doctrine subversive of morality, society, or government; but I prefer to rest my case here.

The next inquiry is whether there is any way of controlling the enormous power exercised by a few irresponsible persons in moulding the characters and forming the habits of thought of a large and the most promising part of the youth of our land.

The true remedy for the first of these evils is, of course, to give up entirely the circulation of all novels among children. I am conscious, however, that the public is not yet ready for this heroic remedy, though I have not the slightest hesitation in affirming that it will come to it in time; not because of the dangers connected with this practice, but because of its expense. When the public sees clearly that it would actually be cheaper for a public library to *give away* fifty copies of a story like Stevenson's "Treasure Island," for instance, published in newspaper form, than to buy *one* copy in book form and circulate it twenty-five times, then it will peremptorily demand the cessation of this costly process of furnishing free entertainment of a doubtful character to the young. Failing this desirable reform, I would suggest the passing of a general act by our State legislatures making it a penal offence, punishable by fine or imprisonment, for any persons connected with a public library to loan to a minor any book of an immoral character after they shall have received official notice from the proper authority that it is immoral. And I should add to the act this further provision, that no book of an openly-immoral character should be permitted to leave the library building.

The intent of this provision, of course, would be to limit the reading of such books to proper persons.

But the most important question is, Who shall constitute this "proper authority"? It is evident that it must be a body whose decisions, being final and without appeal, shall commend themselves to the people as intelligent and impartial. It cannot be a mere local board, for except in the larger towns and cities it would be difficult to find persons qualified to exercise this authority wisely. In some places there are "examining committees" of leading citizens appointed by the trustees to investigate into the workings of the library, to point out evils, and to suggest reforms, but many years' experience has proved that these committees, however well-meaning and intelligent, cannot be relied upon to do a reforming work. In some instances their reports have simply served to hide the evils which it was their duty to expose.

It is not necessary to create any new board of State censors of public libraries, for there is already existing in all our States, if I am not mistaken, a body of officials impliedly well qualified for the task. I mean the Board of Education. Here are a number of citizens of high standing whose official work is entirely in connection with the education of the young, who ought to be the best judges of what books would be injurious to the immature mind, and whose judgments would command the entire respect and confidence of the community. To them should be referred any book which a parent or teacher regarded as harmful, and if on their examination it proved, in their judgment, to be unfit for the reading of young people, their notification of this fact to the different public libraries of the State should cause its immediate withdrawal from circulation. In addition, it should be required of every public library to send to the Board of Education a list of all works of notorious and undisguised immorality which it contained, and thereafter annually to send a list of all such works purchased within the year, together with their cost and the number of times which they were consulted. It will be evident, I think, that this provision would tend greatly to check these purchases, which, from the very nature of the case, are now made secretly, the fact that such books are in the library not being made evident in the public catalogues. The Board, having before it an exact statement, would know the extent of the evil and its dangerous possibilities to any special community, and would doubtless

find means, if necessary, to put an end to it altogether in individual cases. Trustees naturally would hesitate any longer to spend comparatively large sums—for these books are invariably very costly—for the productions of these literary *cloacæ*, if they had to make an official report of the fact to the State authorities.

I am sanguine enough to believe that these measures, or measures similar to them, if adopted, would have an influence which would reach farther than the public libraries themselves. In them, I am confident, it would be powerful for good. Purchasing committees and agents would be far more careful in their selection of books for these institutions, if they knew that their choice in doubtful cases would possibly be subjected to official scrutiny and censure, and with every year there would, in all probability, be less and less occasion for the Board to exercise its functions as censor. But beyond and above this, I believe that literature itself would be influenced by the action of this Board. Now there is no authority to pronounce a book immoral in its tendency and teaching, unless it is of so gross a character as to come within the reach of the law against obscene publications; and of these I have not been treating. Accordingly an author may offend glaringly against the public morals and not suffer for it, except in the adverse criticisms of the press, which simply help the sale of the book. But let a novel be officially pronounced unfit for circulation in the public libraries of a dozen States by the Boards of Education of those States, and the thing would wear an entirely different aspect both to author and publisher. Simply from the point of view of the latter, the cutting-off of this important purchaser, the public library, would be a very serious consideration. But the reproach of an official branding, as it were, of one's work would, I am convinced, deter many a young and foolish author from seeking popularity by such dangerous and degrading means. To take but a single instance: had such a power as I propose rested in our various Boards of Education, I do not believe that "The Quick or the Dead?" would ever have been written. But it is to the public library that the greatest gain would come. The official recognition of it as an integral and important part of the general system of education would tend to raise it to the very highest plane of usefulness.

JAMES MASCARENE HUBBARD.

THE REAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN.

BY MRS. ROSE TERRY COOKE.

THERE IS so much said of late years about the "Rights of Women" that the phrase has become to some women a terror and a disgust; though a certain class have made it a war-cry, and attached to it a meaning and an importance alike unwarranted and unpleasant.

Those who thus clamor for their "rights" mean by that phrase, to express the matter succinctly, the rights of women to be men. It is useless here either to ignore or contend with their dogmas, for in the end they will inevitably expose their own futility and presumption. It would be simple folly to notice the effort of a botanist to transform all the currant-bushes in the country into oak-trees; and no man or set of men would attempt to train cats to the duties and offices of dogs: ridicule would extinguish their essays and contempt be their portion. The Creator who peopled the earth with various sorts of animals, and made it beautiful with forests and flowers, each bearing seed according to its kind, when he also created man to rule over them, made also a distinction in humanity. "Male and female created he them," and no puny struggles of the race can nullify his original purpose. But in all this clamor, and the just scorn with which the more rational portion of the race treat it, there has been little or no attention paid to the fact that women—as women—have certain rights of their own coexistent with their position in life, which are too apt to be ignored by the men with whom they are associated in any relation. Let us examine a few of these rights, which ought to be self-evident both to men and women.

First—A woman has a right to respect, as a woman, as long as she respects herself. It is true that it is difficult for men to do this when the spirit of the age is against such an opinion. We

find the newspapers full of skits at women : their folly, their extravagance, their ignorance, their shortcomings as mothers, wives, girls in society, especially mothers-in-law and "old maids," are the theme of story and illustration everywhere. And it is not women who write these stories or sketch these illustrations, but men who have mothers, sisters, and wives of their own. Any true and manly man should show respect to women for the sake of his own mother—the mother who bore him at the risk of her very life in cruel anguish and intolerable terror; who reared him with a mother's patience through his helpless infancy and ungrateful childhood : for this office alone should he respect the sex to which he owes so much. And the man whose wife has borne him a family of children should be branded by society as he is by God if he treats that wife with less respect and honor than he would the noblest and greatest among men. Yet the world swarms with men who rob women of this inalienable right all their wretched lives; who treat their mothers and their wives with contumely and cruelty. All women know this to be true, and resent in their hearts the contempt of their husbands and brothers and sons. This it is that drives them thoughtlessly into a struggle to remodel the laws of the land through the doubtful expedient of woman suffrage, through which they hope to reform the laws in their favor. A little calm reflection would show them that any law is worthless that is not enforced by public opinion or public and pressing need. Yearly our legislatures enact laws that are daily broken. Who keeps the dog laws, the liquor laws, the laws of trespass, and numerous other statutes ? Laws deliberately broken are worse than useless ; they are the seeds of rebellion and anarchy; and no human law will help women to abrogate divine edicts. The only hope of women lies in the training of their sons : the boy who is taught from infancy to obey and respect his parents will be worth more to the cause of true "women's rights" than a whole code of legal enactments.

Second—Women have a right to care and consideration on the score of their physical organization. However eager and voluble is the clamor of the "Women's Rights" party to be placed on an equality with men, the very laws of Nature laugh at such a reasonless demand. Can a woman, even an abnormally-strong woman, do the hard, rough work of the world ? Can women construct railways, canals, houses, sail ships, clear away

forests, become pioneers of civilization, or explore remote places of the earth? Could a woman do what Stanley has done? Could she even perform the labor of a common "navvy," who digs all day, week after week, year after year? Every woman knows, if she would only allow it, that this is impossible. Men have an incontrovertible argument against this equality in "their dynamic reasons of stronger bones," and every man knows that women are "the weaker sex" by reason of their physical constitution: therefore I say that women have a right to care and consideration on this account. But do they get it? Where is the man, among the working class especially, who will not let his wife, his mother, his daughter, or his sister overwork herself for his support or his aggrandizement? The records of our lunatic asylums fully bear out this statement: one-third of their female patients come from farms, where they rise early and go to rest late, working incessantly through winter and summer, no matter what is their physical condition; bearing and rearing children through it all; uncheered by recreation, unsolaced by rest; not so much considered as the herded cows or the stabled horses, for these animals cost hard-earned money, but a woman can be had for the asking, and worked like a slave without wages. It is a mistaken economy that deprives women of the kindness and care that should lighten their burdens and assuage their anxiety. Men assume toward them the attitude of the immortal Bagnet toward his capable wife,—

"I never saw the old girl's equal! But I never own to it before her. Discipline must be maintained!"

A few kind words, a little appreciation, even a frank acknowledgment of the work she has done, are like reviving balm to weak and weary women; it pays to praise us—we are so foolishly fond of kind words.

"A merry heart goes all the day;
Your sad one tires in a mile-a!"

And is not this small and easily-rendered wage, which benefits the giver as well as the receiver, a true right of every woman?

Third—A woman has a right to her own religious opinions and preferences; but how rarely is it accorded to her. The married woman almost inevitably leaves her own church and goes with her husband, whether he is a member of the church he attends or

not. Daughters, too, come to years of discretion, whatever may be their opinions or their wishes, are almost always expected to go to church with their parents. Indeed, not long since I read a pamphlet in defence of a certain sect, of which the opening argument was that people should always go to church where their parents did! This extraordinary reasoning, which in its full extent would render futile all endeavors to convert Romanists, Jews, infidels, or even hereditary heathen, to a better way than that in which their ancestors walked, is carried out in too many families to-day. It is as much a woman's right as a man's to select the denomination to which she will belong.

Fourth—Every mother-woman has a right to share in the decisions of the father concerning their children's education. It is impossible for a man engaged in the active business of life, separated from his children during the weekdays and not extremely intimate with them on Sundays, to understand their characters as well as the mother, who is their daily friend and guide. She knows how the timid and sensitive nature of one of her girls unfits her for fighting her way through a public school; while the courage, alacrity, and self-confidence of another will thrive in such a conflict with others, and find its true level there. She knows that the dreamy, studious boy, who does not care for athletic sports or mathematical problems, but spends his leisure in the fields inspecting stones with his geological hammer, hunting for floral specimens, impaling rare and curious insects round the crown of his hat, is meant to be a professor of natural sciences; while his sturdy, hearty young brother, always "trading" and "dickering" with his fellows, standing high in his arithmetic class, and with a keen eye for his just share in "treats," will be a successful merchant. To the unacquainted father these are generalized as boys and girl, he is just as likely as not to insist on putting the naturalist into a dry-goods shop and trying to make a clergyman of the sharp boy; and it is here that the mother's right to advise, and even insist, comes in; it is the right of superior knowledge, and should be willingly conceded to her.

Fifth—A woman has a right to choose her own husband. To her belong all the consequences of such a choice. It is well to offer advice, to set before her the true character of the man she elects to marry, and thereby to clear your own conscience,—the only good result, as a general thing, of such advice!—but to at-

tempt coercion of any sort is a fatal error. Marriage is the great disciplinary institution of the sexes, and its general trend and special detail cannot be averted or avoided by the average man and woman. To women a mistake in this matter is a mistake that involves portentous consequences, and no reasonable man or woman should be willing to take the great responsibility of directing or forcing that choice which will make or mar a whole life. The angelic young women in modern novels, who marry men they loathe to save a father or a brother from deserved shame or pecuniary ruin, are not and should not be the women of real life. "Thou shalt not do evil that good may come" is a divine truth, and ought to be impressed on the minds of our girls. But there is little danger that they will to-day indulge in such self-sacrifice; their end and aim are chiefly to "have a good time," and if they mistake the way to that end they learn a great and stern lesson, which may educate them for the eternal future. Therefore, as it is a purely individual matter, concerning the parties thereto far more than any one else, I contend that it is the inalienable right of every woman to select her own husband and take the consequences on her own shoulders.

Sixth—A woman should be allowed to choose her own physician. This seems on its face to be a trivial matter, but it is one that involves much suffering or much comfort, and is intimately connected with her health—that greatest of earthly blessings. For women, particularly in illness, are nervous, fastidious, and susceptible to odd impressions and strange fancies to an extent no man can comprehend. A sick man is cross or stupid; if he is that *rara avis*, a patient sufferer, he is also silent and grateful; but a woman fidgets, cries, exhausts herself with imaginary terrors and apprehensions, and looks forward to her physician's visits with disgust or delight, as the case may be. If she is so unfortunate as to dislike the aspect, the manner, the voice of the most skilful doctor to be had, he will do her little good: she will not tell him her symptoms; she will resent his lightest touch; she will probably refuse to take his prescriptions, or find some means of disposing of his pills and potions wide of their due destination; while if she likes the face and speech of another, much less skilful it may be, his presence will give her comfort, allay her nervous exasperation, and soothe her terrors; her pulse will grow quiet, her restlessness subside, and she will accept his

doses with that faith in their efficacy which adds so much to the power of all drugs, and invests the tiniest sugary pellets with all-powerful virtues. It is the petty tyranny of many men to force upon their households physicians of their own choosing, who are objectionable to their wives or daughters: it would be for the good of such autocrats if they reflected that this procedure injures themselves in its reflex action, for it only prolongs the invalidism of the shrinking and suffering patient, and makes the bills, which even autocrats detest, far heavier than they like to pay. Therefore, for the sake of both parties it is best—would it be idle to add kindest?—for women to be allowed this useful right, and to choose the presence that cheers them and the face they trust to medicine both mind and body.

Seventh—Every woman has a right to a home, unless stringent circumstances prevent. I mean to a home in the house of her husband or her father. This seems an unnecessary statement to many people; yet there are instances, numerous enough, where it applies. There may be a nominal home, where a wife leads such an unconsidered, down-trodden existence, so lorn and loveless a life, that it is no real home to her, but the dwelling of a captive in the grip of a tyrant; a position where even her children treat her with cold contempt, and the very servants of the house ignore and despise her. Is this to be called a home? Yet such there are; some that I have personally known; more of which I have heard. And there are parents who, for reasons they do not make known, exile their children from their houses; often to please the caprices of other members of the family who do not desire to be bored or affronted by the offending member; often for some freak of their own temper or perverted idea of their own unfilled demands. No idea of duty inspires or daunts them; they do not reflect that they gave existence to these children and owe them unfailing patience and kindness to alleviate that infliction. To deprive a boy or a girl of the shelter and refuge and amenities of a household to which he or she has a birthright is an intolerable injustice, and one that seems impossible; yet is not.

I once heard a man say to his wife, referring to the trouble his wayward daughter gave her (the daughter of his earlier marriage):

"I wish I could afford to send her away to school, and spare you this anxiety and trouble."

"Never!" was the energetic reply. "Not if you were worth millions. She is your child, and she has a right to a home in her father's house; it is my duty to make her home a shelter and benefit to her; and I will, at whatever cost to myself!"

Is not this the right thing to do? Is a man or woman ever cast into such piteous and unchristian exile as when he or she has "no place on the earth to call home," as I heard a woman say once, with a voice of mortal sadness?

Eighth—A woman has a right to the use and control of her own money, whether she inherits or earns it. There is a general feeling among married men that women ought not to have money of their own; that they should ask their masters for every cent they need. I have known a man to invest his wife's small portion, and make her come to him for every needed dollar, until, being a woman of spirit, she insisted on an allowance. I have known another to take the money left to his children, absolutely to be in their own control, and, without ever rendering them account, invest it in ways they knew nothing of and which proved greatly to their loss, long after they were of full age. They could not go to law with their father, as another set of heirs might have done, but had to bear this injustice and dishonesty as best they might. I have known still another, unfortunately executor of his father-in-law's will, to take money left his wife under that will and spend it as he pleased, so that when she needed and demanded it it was gone. And yet another who, being trustee of an estate from which his wife received a considerable annuity, never allowed her to have one cent of that income, though he was a rich man himself. Nor did he ever give her any money for her own use; she had a bill at the grocer's and the shoe-shop, but he bought her clothes without any reference to her wishes, and paid her dressmaker. I could multiply such instances till time failed me; they are the rule rather than the exception; and these are the humiliating and painful experiences that have driven women to arise and fight for the chimerical rights they demand, considering those the real way to amend the sufferings they do not exploit.

When men are ready to allow women their true and just rights, to remember the admonitions of Holy Writ,—"Husbands, love your wives and be not bitter against them"; "Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace

of life, that your prayers be not hindered" (significant latter clause!); "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it"; "Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath"; "Fathers, provoke not your children to anger, lest they be discouraged,"—then the true rights of women will be achieved. We have much from pulpit and press to impress on us the duties of wives and children; for it is men who preach and edit; but all duty is of its own nature reciprocal, and the other side of these family obligations is just as stringent as that commonly preached and written about.

Looking over the social, the conjugal, the parental status of the sexes in this age of progress, it is sad to see that the true rights of women are so frequently ignored and set aside. It is true we owe the delay of our restoration to these God-given privileges greatly to those "freedom-shriekers" who forget their position and their womanhood, who leave their families neglected and their homes forsaken to rant on platforms and usurp pulpits; the women who demand suffrage for themselves when as yet they are too weak and ignorant to use so mighty a weapon, and try to reverse the creative ordinance that did not make the race all men. These idle and reasonless demands react on the more sensible and faithful part of their own sex, and give men, who are so apt to be deluded by "glittering generalities," the idea that all women are fools.

I can but close this attempt to show that we women have some rights that ought in the name of religion and humanity to be respected, but, alas! rarely are, with repeating what Mrs. Siddons said to Samuel Rogers when once her proud soul was sore at seeing honors heaped upon a brother-actor which she knew she better deserved herself, yet never would attain,—

"I hope, Mr. Rogers, that one day justice will be done to women!"

ROSE TERRY COOKE.

NURSERIES OF CRIME.

BY THOMAS BYRNES, CHIEF INSPECTOR OF POLICE, NEW YORK CITY.

THE LODGING-HOUSES of New York constitute an evil of large and growing proportions. This fact is palpable to any one who has to deal with the criminal classes here, or who is familiar with the methods of life in the least respectable parts of the city through missionary work or in any other way. Of lodging-houses in other cities I have no personal knowledge; but it is fair to presume that the same evil exists in all large cities to a greater or less extent. In the following pages I speak only of New York, and the facts mentioned have all come within the range of my personal experience.

It is undeniable that the lodging-houses of the city have a powerful tendency to produce, foster, and increase crime. Instead of being places where respectable people reduced in circumstances or temporarily short of money can secure a clean bed for a small amount of money, they have come to be very largely frequented by thieves and other criminals of the lowest class, who lodge in these resorts regularly and here consort together and lay their plans for crimes of one sort or another. But this is not the worst feature of the matter. Take the case of a young man who runs away from his home in the country, or for any reason finds himself stranded in the great city. In searching for a cheap place to lodge in, he naturally drifts into one of these lodging-houses, and it is almost inevitable that association with the people who make these places their headquarters will corrupt him. In nine cases out of ten—I am quite confident that this proportion is not too large—he turns out a thief or a burglar, if, indeed, he does not sooner or later become a murderer. Hundreds of instances of this kind occur every year.

The lodging-house in New York is a modern institution. It was started by a man named Howe, who came here from Boston, about twelve years ago. He opened his first lodging-house in

Chatham Street (now Park Row), near Tryon Row. It was a success, and he soon extended the business. When he died, seven years ago, he left a large fortune as the result of his shrewd management of this new enterprise. The number of lodging-houses has increased rapidly since Howe made his first venture, and there are now three hundred and forty-five snch places in the city. There is one class in which fifteen, twenty, or twenty-five cents are charged for a night's lodging, while in another and lower class the prices are only five and ten cents. According to the "Report of the Police Department of the City of New York for the Year Ending December 31, 1888," the "enormous number of 4,649,660 cheap lodgings were furnished during the year" in these resorts. The following table, taken from the report, shows the distribution of lodging-houses among the various precincts:

Precincts.	Lodging-houses and dormitories.			Precincts.	Lodging-houses and dormitories.		
	Number.	Number of rooms.	Lodgers, 1888.		Number.	Number of rooms	Lodgers, 1888.
First	9	325	77,925	Thirteenth	6	22	66,560
Second	21	346	73,045	Fourteenth	5	138	142,350
Fourth	39	2,307	597,870	Fifteenth	14	636	256,585
Fifth	3	24	45,150	Eighteenth	3	43	173,375
Sixth	44	2,086	913,050	Twentieth	1	90	...
Seventh	13	294	127,155	Twenty-first	9	159	63,837
Eighth	11	112	182,500	Twenty-fifth	1	241	36,794
Ninth	3	279	77,600	Twenty-ninth	13	549	104,287
Tenth	12	1,374	438,365				
Eleventh	58	1,293	1,243,200	Total	267	10,439	4,649,660
Twelfth	2	121	30,012				

These figures are obtained by inquiry among the keepers of the known lodging-houses, and, while they do not wholly agree with what I learn from other sources, they are, no doubt, fairly accurate.

There is no law that governs or applies to these places of which I am speaking, except certain sections of the Sanitary Code of the Board of Health, which give the Health Department the right to exercise supervision over them in the matter of cleanliness. In connection with this phase of the subject it will be of interest to quote further from the report of the Police Department for last year.

"Attention has repeatedly been called to that portion of the city covered by the Fourth, Sixth, Tenth and Eleventh Precincts. From the table of arrests it will be

seen that in 1888 there were 23,146 persons arrested in this comparatively small district, or 27.24 per cent. of the entire number of arrests—an increase over the year 1887. Eighteen per cent. of the pawn-shops are located there; more than 16 per cent. of the liquor and beer saloons of the city are flourishing there; more than 57 per cent. of the cheap lodging-houses ply a busy trade, and they furnish nearly 70 per cent. of the lodgings indicated above.

"Again it is urged that there should be some legal regulation by which the cheap lodging-houses could be placed under police supervision. Though it is admitted that many of the patrons of these places are persons in distressed circumstances, yet, where so many are herded together daily and nightly, it is reasonable to suppose there are many disposed to crime. If tenement life tends to immorality and vice certainly the fifty-eight lodging-houses in the Eleventh Precinct, furnishing 1,243,200 lodgings in one year, must have the same or a worse tendency. Reflection upon the figures contained in the above table will lead to the conclusion that we have a large population of impecunious people (all males) which ought to be regarded with some concern.

"It is shown above that an average of 13,152 persons without homes and the influence of family lodged nightly in the station-houses* and in these poorly-provided dormitories—an army of idlers, willing or forced. It is respectfully submitted that social reformers would here find a field for speculation, if not for considerable activity."

The cheapest class of lodging-houses are generally the resort of drunkards and people of the lowest type, though all of them are infested with thieves, idlers, and loafers of every description. Hence it is no exaggeration to assert that they are very hot-beds of crime. More than one murder has been committed in these houses. One well-remembered crime of this sort was that of Quimbo Appo, who stabbed and killed a young man named John Kelly in a lodging-house in Chatham Street. Kelly was the son of respectable parents, but had fallen into dissolute habits, and was accustomed to spend his nights in these resorts. One night Quimbo got into an altercation with him; blows followed, and the result was that Kelly received fatal wounds. Another man was killed in the Phœnix lodging-house in the Bowery. He applied for a lodging, which for some reason was refused; he quarrelled with the clerk, and the clerk killed him, being subsequently acquitted on the ground of justifiable homicide. It was at this same Phœnix house that I and my men not long ago arrested the notorious Greenwall and Miller on the charge of murdering Mr. Lyman S. Weeks in Brooklyn. There is little doubt in my mind that this murder, a most dastardly crime (Mr. Weeks being shot down in his own house by a burglar who had invaded it), was hatched in this or some other house of like character. In the very same place three men were arrested recently for a burglary

* During 1888 there were 150,812 lodgings furnished at the station-houses of the city, making the total number of lodgings 4,800,472.

committed in a residence in Mount Vernon. At the lodging-house No. 262 Bowery we secured a gang of thieves who had been engaged in a series of robberies at Kingston, N. Y., and they were sent up there for punishment. Among other cases of criminals who made their abode in houses of this sort may be mentioned the following, all the acts being of recent occurrence: Charles Hoffman, convicted of highway robbery and sent to the State-prison; James McGann, burglary, sent to the State-prison; Hugh O'Neill, burglary, sent to the State-prison; Jacob Meyer, burglary, sent to the State-prison. There are hundreds of other instances of the same kind.

A case somewhat out of the ordinary run was that of Henry Bishoff, who was convicted of forgery on the complaint of a well-known business man. Bishoff had only been in this country for a year, and for some months he had been out of employment. During this time he lived at the Victoria Hotel lodging-house, at No. 9 Bowery. There he was inoculated with criminal ideas, and he made it a practice to follow letter-carriers while making deliveries. When letters were deposited in small boxes in front of stores and lofts, and a good opportunity presented itself, Bishoff would abstract them by means of long keys and a piece of steel wire. In this way he got a letter out of the box of a leading clothing firm. It was from a Philadelphia house, and contained a check or draft for a large sum. He forged the indorsement of the New York firm, and obtained the money. Subsequently he was arrested by this bureau,* and sentenced to a long term in prison.

Within the last three years crime has increased very rapidly, so far as the lodging-houses of the city are concerned. A large number of young fellows hailing from these places have been arrested for stealing blankets from horses whose drivers have been compelled to leave them for a minute or two, or for picking up anything else of trifling value that they could lay hands on. These are beginners in crime, as a rule, and they undoubtedly associate with older and more experienced men, who tell them how and where to dispose of their booty for a small sum of money. It is in this way that young men get their initiation in crime. I personally have arrested a considerable number of men in lodging-houses for carrying burglars' tools. Hundreds of criminals must

* The Detective Bureau of the New York Police Department.

be made every year through the associations they form in these breeding-places of lawlessness.

Lying on my desk as I write are two tin-types of the cheapest sort, evidently taken in the Bowery. They represent two young "toughs," each holding a pistol at the head of the other. They were taken from the pockets of the young fellows, who were brought into my office the other day on charges of robbery. These photographs interested me, and I asked the boys how they came to be taken in that style. "Oh," they answered, "we held a pistol up to the head of a man one night and got his money, and we just thought we would like to see how we looked." They seemed rather proud of their achievement. I mention this as an illustration of the sort of young criminals the lodging-houses of New York turn out.

During the last two or three years at least four hundred young men have been arrested for petty crimes that originated here. In many of these cases it was the first step in crime that was being taken. Observation in the courts convinces me that three-fourths of the young men called on to plead to various offences are under twenty years of age; they are poorly clad and without means. Their crimes are petty ones as a rule, and they seem to have no realizing sense of the enormity of their deeds. It is the customary thing, when such people are arraigned in the Court of General Sessions, for the judges to assign counsel to defend them, since these criminals have no money to hire professional advice.

Some twelve or thirteen thousand persons sleep almost nightly in the lodging-houses of the city, some of which have as many as three hundred beds. Among the houses of the lowest order are the Kingston in East Broadway, some of those already mentioned, and those at the following numbers: 15, 23, 34, and 68 Bowery, 18 Pell Street, 9 Doyers Street, 197 Worth Street, 33, 35, and 62 Mulberry Street, 44 East Houston Street, 176, 184, and 194 Park Row, and 9 Mulberry Street. One of the very lowest of all is that at No. 18 Pell Street. The charge there is five cents a night, and the lodgers sleep on strips of canvas suspended by ropes, something after the fashion of hammocks. Suppose that a young man, who finds himself in the city without a home or friends or money, gets into a place of this kind; it will take not more than ten days at the furthest to familiarize him with crime

and criminals, and the chances of his leading an honest life afterwards are not one in a hundred—hardly one in a thousand. There are a few Italian lodging-houses in the city; they are very low and dirty, and give the police the greatest trouble of all.

It has frequently been stated to me by thieves that large numbers of foreigners who are criminals have their passage paid to this country by the authorities or by somebody else. When they land here they have no money, or very little, and they immediately flock to the lodging-houses, where they can live for almost nothing, where they meet people congenial to them, and are soon put in the way of engaging again in their criminal pursuits. I remember the case of a boy named Fritz who came here from Antwerp not long ago, and secured employment with one Jacob Thoman. Thoman noticed that the boy acted in a queer, nervous way, and questioned him, whereupon the boy confessed that in Prussia, his native country, he had had a quarrel with another boy, and in a moment of passion had dashed his brains out. The boy was arrested by detectives from this office, and the matter was brought to the attention of the German consul. But the consul had no official advices regarding the matter, no charge was pressed against the boy, and he was discharged. He then went to live in one of the low lodging-houses, where, I suppose, he was instructed in crime. At all events, in a short time he was detected in the act of committing a burglary in the place of business of his former employer. Only recently I arrested a man who was engaged in robbing private houses in the upper part of the city. He told me that he had been sent here on account of being caught in thieving operations "on the other side." He had no money when he arrived except a few shillings, and almost the first place he got into was one of the cheap lodging-houses. He soon became acquainted with the inmates, who were mostly thieves, and in a little while they took him out over the city and set him to stealing. I have not the least doubt that there are numerous cases like this.

But the evils that have been already mentioned are not the only ones that are produced by the lodging-house system. It is notorious that these houses are used every year for the "colonization" of voters. A large number of men register regularly from these places, and they have not the slightest hesitation about swearing in their votes in case they are challenged. Now and then somebody comes to grief through this practice, but it still

flourishes. Not long ago the proprietor of the Windsor, at No. 41 Bowery, was sent to prison for "colonizing" voters. But usually this work is done in the interest of some local political "boss," who stands by the owner of the house in case the latter gets into trouble. This alone is certainly an evil of large dimensions.

I might cite many other cases that have come under my personal observation, where crimes have been the direct offspring of life in lodging-houses. Take the case of "Mike" Drohan, a notorious thief, who lived at the Windsor, to which reference has just been made. Drohan went to Johnstown after the recent horrible disaster, and was shot and killed while engaged in the fiendish work of robbing the dead bodies of victims of the flood. Assuredly there was a case where a criminal got something like his just deserts. Again, these lodging-houses become the dwelling-places of many of the convicts who are released from prison. These men have little money, and very naturally they gravitate to these places, where they are likely to find people they know. These houses they use as their rendezvous, and there they soon arrange to meet their companions and to plot various crimes. Lodging-houses thus play an important part in causing ex-convicts to resume their former vocation.

It may be asked whether these resorts do not serve any useful purpose. Undoubtedly there are frequently worthy people who are glad of an opportunity to get a night's lodging for a trifle; but these are a small minority of the *habitués* of such houses. In the course of my professional duty here I have found among the patrons of these places a sprinkling of professional men who have held good positions in society—lawyers, doctors, civil-engineers, and even authors. In the usual course they have become drunkards, and have gone down the ladder step by step until they have been abandoned by their friends, and have become drunken sots in the lowest lodging-houses, presenting no difference in their personal appearance from the commonest patrons of such places. It would require a conversation with these people to show that they were educated, and had sunk from a lofty position through a lack of will-power. I remember one who was brought here on suspicion, who belonged to a family that had held an exalted position in society. He was the black sheep of the family, and had at length got so low as to consort with the class

of people that are to be found in the cheapest lodging-houses. There seemed to be no possibility of reclaiming him, and I suppose he will spend his days there.

Such is the evil—a menace to good order and the well-being of society of rapidly enlarging proportions. And the remedy? That I conceive to lie outside of my province as a police official. But I am convinced that a remedy ought to be applied—a drastic, searching remedy—and applied without delay. This is not a case for a palliative; as Emerson would say, it is a "case for a gun"—for the knife, the blister, the amputating instruments. I will venture to offer one or two suggestions only, which philanthropists who endeavor to solve the problem may care to take into account. There should be stringent laws enacted by the Legislature for the regulation of lodging-houses in this city. The records and books of these houses should be open at all times to the inspection of the proper authorities. It should be made a misdemeanor for the proprietor of such a house to mutilate or destroy his books, and he should be compelled to keep an accurate record of all his lodgers. This would be important in the matter of preventing fraudulent registration, etc. No person who is not of good character should be permitted to own or maintain a lodging-house, and bonds should be required of and licenses issued to those who desire to carry on this business. In my judgment, based on many years' experience, the lodging-house business should be under the immediate supervision of the police, since they are the officials who practically enforce the laws, and because they have better opportunities than any others for ascertaining the character of persons and places.

THOMAS BYRNES.

CAN THE MOSQUITO BE EXTERMINATED?

BY HENRY C. M'COOK, M. D.

NATURAL SCIENCE has taught the world modesty in its judgments. Many things thought impossible have been done, and the imaginary achievements of the genii and magicians of earlier ages are the work-a-day deeds of modern times. Therefore one may well hesitate to say that the extermination of the mosquito is impossible; yet the facts seem to point that way. The mosquito is an ancient inhabitant of this globe of ours, being found among the fossil insects, and is as catholic in its distribution as venerable in its descent. Having thus far held a place among the myriad creatures of our globe, it is likely to continue its generation. Let us, then, accept it as inevitable that the mosquito cannot be exterminated.

Can the mosquito pest be mitigated? That is quite another question, which has just been raised by a philanthropic gentleman with strong scientific tastes. Dr. Lamborn, who has recently offered a prize for a preliminary study of the habits of dragon-flies, with a view to their propagation as destroyers of mosquitoes, has found the ready ear of the American nation. His manifesto was a "touch of nature" which has proved our New World "kin," for, alas! there are few portions of this beautiful domain where the mosquito has not piped her war-song and drawn blood from human victims. I am constrained by truth, despite the seeming discourtesy, to say "her." It is the female mosquito that does all the damage! Her spouse is a harmless creature. Without claiming any knowledge as a specialist of these very interesting but disagreeable insects, I may offer a few suggestions intended to encourage public sympathy and coöperation with an enterprise which may seem to many chimerical. Certainly nothing is ever done by attempting nothing; and if

we wish to rid ourselves of what is an undoubted pest in certain localities, we must at least "make an effort." Success in limiting the number of mosquitoes pivots upon two points: Hostile Environment and Natural Enemies.

I.

Where the conditions are favorable for propagation and growth, the mosquito, like other creatures, will flourish. If those conditions can be made unfavorable, the insect must decrease. This compels us to ask, What are favorable conditions for the mosquito's development?

The question is easier asked than accurately answered. In point of fact, the mosquito has a cosmopolitan distribution. It is supposed to have its paradise in tropical countries, but it flourishes in Labrador. It affects low-lying positions, but lovers of the Adirondack Mountains will recall visions of "smudges," and cheese-cloth canopies on rustic banks, and battles with swarms of culicidæ amid the soughing of pines and the sweet fragrance of the balsam. It loves the interior, and many a veteran may recall the days when he hunted prairie-chickens on the plains of Illinois with mosquito-netting twisted around his hat and face; yet it is said, though good testimony could be drawn to the contrary, that "a few" mosquitoes have habitat along the seashore of New Jersey! But wherever found, one condition seems to be essential to its active development. It must have water.

The mother mosquito deposits her eggs in minute boat-like masses upon the surface of water. From these eggs come little larvæ, or worms, or maggots, to use popular words. These wee things inhabit the water, living most of the time at or near the bottom, where they are said to feed upon decaying matter and the micro-organisms that swarm in such conditions. The question has often been asked me, "What were mosquitoes made for, anyhow?" If those who have specially studied the habits of the insects are correct, they certainly render important and useful service during their larval stage by cleansing swamp lands and stagnant pools from the miasms which plague mankind with various forms of fever. Let this much be said to the credit of this dreadfully maligned insect, for it behooves the naturalist, at least, to give "even the devil his due." If our mosquito were only

pleased to confine its existence to this stage, there would be no need to write this paper, for it would be numbered among the benefactors of our race, or, perhaps, like many another benefactor, be utterly unknown.

The mosquito's brief period of larval life is divided between feeding upon the aforesaid micro-organisms, etc., and occasional excursions to the surface for a breath of air. Unfortunately, the larva soon becomes a pupa with a greatly enlarged thorax, which gives the body a club-shaped appearance. Two broad paddles or caudal swimming leaves are fixed at the apex of the body, by which the mosquitoes can wiggle their way through the water. They are active in their habits, but they do not eat. Perhaps their larval diet of miasms proves too much for them. Soon they awake at the call of Nature to another element and another sphere of activity.

It may shock the æsthetic sensibilities of the general public to speak of anything beautiful or fairy-like in the natural history of the mosquito; but really such terms are truly applicable when the mosquito pupa begins to transform. Let me briefly describe the process as entomologists have observed it. These little fish-like larvæ have spent their first stage of being swimming about in stagnant water, devouring the living atoms that swarm therein. They reach their second stage by casting off the larval skin and becoming pupæ. In this stage they remain rolled up like a ball, and float at the surface of the water for the purpose of breathing through the two respiratory tubes on the top of their backs. If disturbed by any unwonted agitation of the water, they suddenly uncurl their bodies and whirl over and over from side to side. This turnverein existence, spent with no sustaining nutriment but atmospheric air, terminates in the course of a few days.

Now the little water-tumblers are ready for another transformation. The skin splits on the back between the breathing-tubes, and a little boat is thus formed, as gracefully curved at the bow and poop as the imperial barge of Cleopatra. Out of this fairy bark there suddenly issues a winged creature. The head, the body, the limbs, burst from the opening in the hard skin. The slender legs are raised on the edges of the empty bark until, spreading its wings and pluming itself for flight into sunlight and air, the insect rises, while by the reflex of its upward bound its tiny bark is overset and sinks beneath the wave. If the poet

or artist were to catch this vision at the moment the insect leaves its abandoned bark and stretches its wings for flight, he might well imagine that he had obtained a glimpse of the good old days when one might see "old Proteus" or young Venus "rising from the sea." Alas, that Professor Gradgrind, the naturalist, should be compelled to tell him that he had only seen a mosquito transforming!

This is the natural history of the animal's environment. The practical question is, How can one so control these conditions as to limit the multiplication of the insects? Obviously the answer is, Limit their natural breeding-grounds! When swamps are dried up, when stagnant pools are filled up, when brackish lakes and sluggish streams are drained and dredged and graded so as to give free current to their waters, when the swamp grasses, weeds, sedges, and various plants in which mosquitoes find refuge after transformation are cut down and cleared away,—when, in short, the scythe, lawn-mower, grubbing-axe, and gardener's hand of diligence, thrift, cleanliness, and care have turned our country into a cultivated garden, the days of the mosquito as a pest will be numbered. *Culex pipiens* and all the other species of culicidæ (the family of mosquitoes and gnats) will still have their representatives in the land; but they will be shorn of their power to deplete the veins of summer cottagers and guests and the purses of summer landlords.

II.

The second factor in limiting the number of mosquitoes is that of natural enemies. Of these only two may be mentioned—the dragon-fly and the spider. It is a strange illustration of human perversity that these two animals, whose lives are spent in serving man, should be largely under the ban of human prejudice. The dragon-fly is dreaded; the spider is hated; and yet they are nature's checks upon the mosquito and other insects that otherwise would make our earth well-nigh uninhabitable.

Is it practicable so to develop the dragon-fly and spider that their special gifts from Nature can be further used in the service of man by directing them especially against the mosquito? The first step in the practical consideration of such a question, of course, is that human prejudice should be set aside and these two animals recognized in their true relations to the insect world.

Dr. Lamborn's circular concerning the propagation of the dragon-fly, which has evoked this inquiry, will doubtless call forth a great deal of valuable information from entomologists better equipped for treating the subject than myself. But a few words on this point may not be out of place. "What is a dragon-fly?" asked an intelligent city gentleman who had read Dr. Lamborn's note. I attempted to explain, and, indeed, took the pains to show him a figure of the insect. "Oh!" was the exclamation, "that's a devil's darning-needle!" Yes; and the name is expressive of the attitude of English-speaking people towards this serviceable insect. I have read of a school—if memory serves me truly, it was situate in that highly-developed centre of American civilization, New York City—whose session was broken up by the advent of an innocent dragon-fly through an open window. An alarm raised by one scholar passed through the entire room: "A devil's darning-needle! A devil's darning-needle!" The ominous phrase, piped in the shrill quaver of terrified childhood, alarmed the teacher, and the agitation became so general that the school had to be dismissed as an act of humanity.

Again, I well remember, when a small boy upon the hill of eastern Ohio, gazing with open-eyed wonder upon the beautiful forms of these insects as they flitted to and fro, and heard my older companions speak of them as "snake-feeders." "Look out! There's a snake somewhere near! Here's a snake-feeder!" I do not even now know the origin of that term, or the meaning attached to it by people generally; but to my child's imagination there came up a picture of these strange insects haunting some shady nook by running streams, where, under the shelter of limestone rocks, the serpent reared his head and thrust out his quivering tongue to receive his daily supplies of food from his servant, the "snake-feeder." Is it strange if boyish fancy somehow associated the incident with all sorts of demoniac folk-lore and ghost-stories? And yet, within two weeks from the date of this writing, a well-informed gentleman who did not know this insect by the name of dragon-fly recognized it at once when I spoke of it as a "snake-feeder." With a keener sense of the beautiful, the French have called this insect *demoiselle*. But for the most part English terminology expresses superstitious fear or ignorance.

There is, however, another popular name which shows that the kindly service of these beautiful neuroptera, the libellulidæ,

is known and appreciated. It is "the mosquito-hawk." Those who have watched the dragon-fly's habits must have noticed that, as it flits here and there, it is engaged in seizing and devouring various insects. In regions infested by mosquitoes, those creatures contribute largely to the dragon-fly's appetite. This deadly war, waged in its perfect estate upon the perfect form of mosquito, is only a continuation of the habit of larval life. Like the mosquito, the mother dragon-fly oviposits in the water, and its young are reared under similar conditions. The dragon-fly larva is as voracious as the imago, and destroys enormous numbers of the aquatic larvæ of other insects, including, of course, the larvæ and pupæ of mosquitoes. Thus it comes about that in both stages of their development dragon-flies are the natural enemies of the mosquito in both stages of its life.

Now emerges the query, Can this "mosquito-hawk" be propagated in such numbers, in regions most frequented by the mosquito, as materially to contribute to the mitigation of the pest? The question is one that can only be answered by experiment, and certainly the interests involved to both human property and human comfort are sufficient to justify the undertaking. There appears to be no difficulty in rearing the aquatic larvæ and pupæ of dragon-flies in artificial conditions. An ordinary aquarium, a good-sized jar, or a glass tumbler will suffice for a successful experiment. The matter which needs most to be attended to in such primitive undertakings is to separate the more ferocious forms from the less.

Dr. Lamborn's offer of a prize for a paper upon the methods of propagating dragon-flies is intended simply as a preliminary step. If the inquiry should develop facts that seem sufficient to justify further experiments and researches, no doubt there will be money enough forthcoming to enter upon this larger undertaking. In the meantime let us encourage the endeavor. It can certainly do no harm. It will, beyond doubt, develop many interesting facts in natural history; and if it shall fail to reach its objective point, it will at least have enlightened the nation somewhat as to the real character of one of the most beautiful and serviceable inhabitants of our insect world.

I now come to another natural enemy of the mosquito, concerning whose habits I can speak with something more of authority. The spider is Nature's chief check against the undue in-

crease of insects. Despised Arachna is entitled by her services to occupy the chief place among invertebrate philanthropists. It is, I might almost say, absolutely harmless to mankind. With the exception of an occasional alleged "spider bite" issuing in suffering or death, and delivered by the traditional and indefinite "black spider," I know of no evil that can be charged against the spider. True, as, long ago, the wise Proverbialist said, "She taketh hold with hands, and is in king's palaces." She builds her cobwebs in our homes, but there is no harm in that. If one will take the pains to study the cobwebs, they will be found beautiful structures; and, at all events, the housewife can brush them away without encouraging hatred for the harmless creature that makes them. For, be it considered, the spider only comes into our homes because mosquitoes and other insects also come! She comes, not seeking to harm us, but to help us, and therefore for the sake of her motive, if she be not welcome, let her, at least, be thought of kindly.

The number of insects of all sorts and sizes destroyed by spiders simply passes calculation. If one will walk out on a dewy morning, with his eyes open for spider-webs, he will be surprised to find how many there are, and how various, too, the forms of spinning-work that meet him. All over this new-ploughed field he will find them; in yonder meadow, also, hanging by myriads upon myriads on the grasses. Along that hedgerow they are nested and have woven their dainty snares. In the branches of these shrubs and on the foliage of yonder trees are other hosts. If one will push back the foliage, he will see yet others, spiders of the wandering group, that stalk their prey as do the wild beasts of the forests, crouching on trunk and branches and lurking among the leaves. If one turns to the earth, other myriads are seen whose homes are on the ground, or who build slight webs close to the surface. These have laid the axe at the very root of the tree, and are destroying the insects ere they rise from the surface to visit our homes. All these unnumbered multitudes of spiders are engaged during every moment of their existence in waging relentless war upon the insect world. When one considers how many spiders there are, and that they all thus feed upon their natural food, the insects, he may form some just conception of how needful they are to mankind. I do not hesitate to say that, unless Nature should provide some equivalent in

the way of check upon insects, man could not dwell in many inhabited parts of the world were it not for the friendly service of spiders.

But do the spiders have a special taste for mosquitoes? it may be asked. They take what comes to them, and when mosquitoes are abundant mosquitoes are taken. I have counted in an orb-weaver's snare, spun upon the railing of the long bridge over Deal Lake, New Jersey, thirty-eight mosquitoes at one time hanging entangled upon the viscid spirals. Times without number have I seen like destruction wrought to mosquitoes by spiders' webs; for it is a fact that, even after the aranead has satisfied its appetite, its snare continues to capture insects. On one occasion I took the pains to count the number of insects of various species upon one large web which was spread in a favorable position, and found that there were two hundred and thirty-six. It is a most common thing to observe three, four, or half a dozen flies or other insects trussed up upon the viscid orb of some of our orb-weaving species. It is needless to add the conclusion from the above facts: if people would decrease the number of mosquitoes, let them encourage the multiplication of spiders.

The writer of this paper has not aimed to enter learnedly or exhaustively upon the subject, but simply to give a few hints by way of indicating the lines along which we may successfully consider the question, Can the mosquito be exterminated?

HENRY C. MCCOOK.

MINISTERS' WIVES.

BY MARION HARLAND.

In no profession—politics not excepted—do personal address and individual popularity avail for more than in that of the clergyman. The most distinguished itinerant who ever bore orders recorded a statement to this effect that sounds like a sigh of resignation to the inevitable. "His letters, say they,"—quoting his critics,—"are weighty and strong, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech of no account." From this and other hints dropped, as of their own weight, in these same letters—notably references to partisans of his colleagues, Apollos and Cephas—we may infer that Paul's preaching in Corinthian pulpits did not "draw," and that—a thing stranger yet! although he was either a bachelor or widower (probably the latter)—he was not "popular as a pastor."

Returning to our first assertion, we may join to it a second as dogmatic. In no other profession, vocation, or craft, do a man's domestic relations so seriously affect his success. The physician may be a thrice-wedded widower in quest of a fourth twin-soul, or a *divorcé*, or an exemplary Benedict, and not gain or lose a patient as the result of any of these conditions. The lawyer's private life lies entirely without the walls of office and court-room. Merchant and manufacturer command custom according to the excellence of their wares and their cleverness in putting them on the market. That Xantippe is a pestilent scold does not mar the force of Professor Socrates's lectures; Crispin may beat his "woman" daily, yet warrant a perfect fit; homely, unlettered Rachel Jackson could not keep her husband out of the Presidential chair, nor fascinating Frances Cleveland keep hers in it.

Paul, frankly acknowledging that his oratory was deficient in the suction-principle, and using zealously his compensatory epistolary talent, lets us into other interesting matters of personal life

and opinion. He stickles stoutly for his right to "lead about a wife (who 'is a believer') even as the rest of the Apostles, and as Cephas." This is but one of the lawful privileges cited in his Socratic appeal to the Corinthians, who were, apparently, "difficult" parishioners. In conclusion, he reminds them in sudden calm, as of abrupt recollection of what checks haste and heat: "Nevertheless, we did not use this right; but we bear all things, that we may cause no hindrance to the Gospel of Christ." Perhaps he did not mean to include among possible hindrances the exercise of the right to lead about a pious wife. The unlearned and common-sensible reader will doubtless differ on this point from the erudite (and wedded) commentator. If he did not allude to it, he might have done so with pertinence and with power.

Which leads directly to a third dogma, seriously considered and solemnly expressed. A clergyman's wife can, and (Heaven help him and her!) she often does, mar his usefulness, even to utter destruction thereof, but it is not given to her ever to rivet his hold upon the affections of his charge; to place or to maintain him in a desirable position. She has fatal influence in pulling him from his high estate. Let her be saint, seraph, or *diplomate*, she cannot sustain him there, when the wind of churchly favor veers. It may be the will of Providence, as interpreted by session, vestry, or consistory, that the unbelieving (translated freely "obnoxious") wife may lose a church to the believing (popular) husband. The reversal of positions has no appreciable effect upon Providence or people.

This is especially deplorable, since Our Minister's partner is so often selected for the qualities that would make her "a good pastor's wife." That the theologue must be mated, and the sooner the better, is a postulate. The attempt to work it out as a problem would threaten a *reductio ad absurdum* to him who weighs the power for undoing vested in the other party to the indissoluble contract.

Seriousness deepens into sadness with increase of observation and experience. A "call" to the ministry of reconciliation as God meant the work to be, is the most sublime commission ever put into the hand of man. The leaning toward—the aptitude for—even what competent judges pronounce to be a "vocation" for the clerical profession, as warped and varnished by human agency—is a caricature at which we could more easily weep than

laugh. The man of God no longer directs the battle as a general surrounded by his staff. He fights on foot in the *mêlée*, and as often meets his death from a traitor's hand as from a face-to-face foe. Long pastorates are in disfavor. Our warrior sleeps on the field, one ear open for alarm or for marching orders. His armor should be light and his *impedimenta* few. A wife and children are *impedimenta*.

Dismissing metaphor, let us recall how often the divine of learning, experience, and piety knows himself to be barely tolerated by a church incapable of appreciating him; yet, in consideration of the salary, grudgingly but promptly paid which yields a support for his family, he dare not resign. A rich vulgarian, an officer in the church presided over by such a man, described the situation aptly: "The people have the whip-hand when the pastor is a married man. However high-strung he may be, he thinks twice before he upsets the wagon that carries his wife and babies." "Send us a young man without incumbrance," writes the frontier church that needs a master-builder, and cannot afford to pay for him.

Wise widower of Tarsus! "That we may cause *no hindrance* to the Gospel of Christ."

The duties of the preacher who is also a pastor demand his best powers, and all of them. The service he renders in the pulpit is but a modicum of that exacted and given. If not a success socially, he is a success nowhere. Pastoral visitation is not now a solemn progress of the parish with catechism for children and spiritual converse for their elders. All that has gone out with the rod of the tithing-man and the "awful circle" of church discipline. The people catechise and judge and admonish their spiritual head in this our day. Our popular pastor is a man skilled in small-talk and courtly or jolly "ways"; wondrous in tact and adaptation of manner and language to shades of intellect and breeding; a man of many sides, not one of which is his very own. Should he choose a wife of and for himself, there is a moral certainty that at least one marriage will be a failure in all eyes except, perhaps, his. To fit a woman of mortal mould to the needs and fancies of a parish is a task beyond archangelic ability.

We see women attempt it every day, it is true. The idea that a clergyman, being a model man, must make a model husband;

the devout tendency of the feminine nature; the fact that men of the cloth are usually refined, well-educated, and well-mannered, are considerations that supply the market with minister's wives, until a confirmed clerical celibate is almost as rare as an incorrigibly disconsolate and reverend widower. The success of the Guild with the fair sex is too patent to be argued here.

Thus far there is no cause for cavil. Paul settled the *right* of the question for our generation, as for his. If our Clericus could seclude his hearth-stone angel from parish eyes and parish work, seeking in the home she makes for him the balm and cheer our physician and lawyer find in private life, she might be a helpmeet for him in the best sense of the obsolete term. But from the moment he installs her as mistress of the manse, the complexion of his public life is changed. It is not only disappointed spinsters and managing mammas who look at him with different eyes. His status is entirely altered. His gentle partner may be a timid shadow stealing at his heels. It is a shadow that affects form and perspective. The shepherd ceases to be interesting by virtue of circumstance. He must stand or fall according to talent and behavior. An admixture of patronage creeps into the manner and talk of the senior members of his charge. With the juniors, the same feeling verges upon contempt. "Art thou, then, become one of us?" is the half-sneering thought.

The new wife must reinstate him. If she be quick-witted and discreet, she tries to do it by making herself one with "the people," suing for their suffrages (always for love's sake and *his*) by every winning art she can command. Independent women, disdainful of subterfuge, girding at unjust exactions, defy impertinent criticism, hold on their own way, and suffer—with their husbands—the consequences of self-will.

There is, strictly speaking, no propriety in expecting the woman who has espoused a clergyman to have, *ex officio*, special fitness for all departments of charitable and religious labor. Common-sense rules that she may suit him excellently well as a wife, yet be endowed with no peculiar gifts for "leading meetings" and "taking chairs." Yet, by an anomalous incongruity, inseparable from the situation, the next worst thing to absolute insignificance in her case is decided significance. To outshine or outwork her lord is to demonstrate his insufficiency to fill the high and responsible office to which he was elected. If she be a cipher, she de-

tracts from his worth. He cannot, after the manner of other public men, bold in the knowledge that their houses are their castles, cast himself between her and her censors with the protest, "A poor thing, but *mine own!*" I have known men thus "hindered" to drag the shrinking weaklings into the fore-front of the battle, prick them into action beyond their strength by frantic appeals to expediency, custom, pride, love, piety, until the victims of a false system, wounded and wearied to their death, fell under the harness so much too heavy for them. The gaps they leave are quickly filled, often by stouter stuff. If I dared relate the humble tragedies of this kind which have come under my eye, the rush of recruits into the places of the fallen martyrs might be less eager.

Hardly less to be pitied is she intended by nature to be a leader among women, who marries the man of her choice with the earnest purpose of playing her part gallantly as his true yoke-fellow and lieutenant. I once heard the monition addressed to a wife of this build by a not unkindly mother in Israel, that covered the point neatly.

"You preside *too* well," said the mentor. "You manage too skilfully and are too ready of speech, too quick to put people at their ease with bright, pretty sayings and all that, you know. Of course, we understand that you mean well and only try to do your duty as a minister's wife; but you put plain, everyday folks at a disadvantage, and even ordinary folks don't like *that*, you see!"

The minister's wife is, in too many parishes, virtually included in the engagement which hires him, body and soul. The unwritten contract is unfair, cruel, and iniquitous. What a private church-member of equal ability and opportunity can do consistently with her duty to her husband and family, standing in her lot in the fear of the Lord and love of her kind, she is bound to undertake—*and nothing more.* What she may or may not accomplish should affect her husband's influence in the same field no more than if he were a lay communicant in the church to which she belongs. The rule which makes the popularity won by her virtues and winsomeness ineffectual to succor him in the hour of need should work both ways, or not at all.

As it is, the mournful conviction that he for whom she would sacrifice ease, comfort, and life itself, would, after all, have done

better for himself and the Master had he never married her, has broken many a loving heart and brave spirit.

I need no mother or father in Israel to warn me that I am touching upon delicate and dangerous ground. If, to my apprehension, it may appear that the modern Nehemiah would work more efficiently and hold out longer to wield the sword in one hand and the trowel in the other, if he were not distracted by the wife's clutch upon his skirt and hampered by the baby bound upon his shoulders, I do not forget that wiser heads than mine have declared and do maintain the celibacy of the clergy to be a pernicious doctrine.

Let me, also, guard myself from invidious personalities by grateful mention of exceptional parishes where the love and loyalty rendered the pastor envelop his home and the dwellers therein in an atmosphere of affectionate appreciation, which is at once sweet and wholesome, invigoration and balm. Labor with such a "people" is a continual joy, and companionship with those who compose it enriches with fuller meaning the phrase "the household of faith."

These churches are not "run upon business principles"—a term much in vogue and favor of late years. The fundamental principle of business being to pay for what you bargain for, and to demand nothing more, excludes the unsalaried and un-contracted-for services of the minister's wife. By so much as she exceeds in zealous good works the layman's consort, she lays an obligation of affection and gratitude upon church and parish.

This is what men on the street call "cold business." It may be, as our postulate declares, that he who, in the mystical language of Holy Writ, is "put in trust with the Gospel," most needs, of all life-warriors, the tender ministry which only a true wife can bestow. Admitting it in the name of common humanity, then, in the name of heavenly pity, let her belong to him—him alone!

MARION HARLAND.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

FRIENDS IN SOUTH AMERICA.

It is not expected that any immediate or direct result will follow the meeting of the International American Congress in October. The most ardent advocate of this plan of bringing our neighbors together never even hoped to see them fall upon one another's necks with *embracios* and vows of eternal peace and affection; nor did the most sanguine market-hunter ever suppose that the delegates from Central and South America would carry home with them our surplus products. We may not sell another yard of prints or another paper of needles during the winter, but this meeting will mark an epoch in the commercial history of this hemisphere; and nowadays, at the present stage of human progress, commerce is the inspiring idea of nations, as conquest was not long ago. The purpose of England in India and Africa was not to gratify a lust for power, nor to evangelize the heathen, but her sacrifice of millions of lives and billions of treasure was an investment to secure a market for the sheetings of Manchester and the hardware of Birmingham.

The results of the conference will be largely sentimental. One of the chiefest motives that inspired its promotors was good-fellowship, neighborly interest, and a desire for a better acquaintance. The ignorance of the people of this country regarding the Latin-American people is simply amazing. It was not long ago that a member of a President's Cabinet in a public speech in the city of New York referred to Buenos Ayres as the capital of Brazil, and a Justice of the United States Supreme Court once asked me what language was spoken in Chili. Most of the geographies studied by the children in our schools refer to the Argentine Republic as a confederation, regardless of the fact that a war was fought some years ago to convince certain provinces that it is not one; and the graphic and illustrated descriptions of the wild horses roaming ownerless over the pampas, which delighted the sense of the picturesque three generations ago, still remain on the pages they have always adorned, although it would be quite as appropriate and truthful to apply them to Iowa or to Illinois. The Englishmen who want to run over to New York for a little buffalo-shooting are no more absurd in their ignorance than the writers of some of our standard geographies; and our friends and neighbors in South America know very little more about us than we know about them, for very good reasons.

The habit of visiting Europe is quite as general among people of means in South America as among the citizens of the United States; and I am told that the number of South Americans at the Paris Exposition is even greater in proportion to population than those who have gone from the United States. It is conceded that the most extensive and tasteful exhibit of American products at the Exposition is furnished by the Argentine Republic. The ladies of South America go to Paris for their gowns and their bonnets, and send their sons and daughters to the universities of England and the Continent to be educated. But very few of them have ever been here.

Why? Because they have no means of transportation. With twenty-one lines of steamships connecting Buenos Ayres with Europe, offering luxurious accommodations and low rates of fare, it is not strange that they seldom come to a country with which they have no direct communication whatever, or that their tradesmen buy of our merchants only such goods as they cannot obtain elsewhere. And, un-

fortunately, the greater portion of our citizens who have made South America an abiding-place have not been such as to inspire the people of that continent with a high regard for the character, or an admiration for the conduct and culture, of the North American. The lack of extradition treaties has tempted certain types of our population to seek asylums south of the Caribbean Sea, and at the expense of our national reputation.

That the leading men of the Latin-American races may see us as we are, that they may study and report upon our national institutions, and the extent of our material development, of which the best-informed of them has but a meagre conception, this conference has been called; and from this observation and contact its greatest good may come. Before proceeding to the formal consideration of certain topics of international interest, they will be asked to inspect the results of our national industry as the guests of the government and the people. It is not possible or practicable to take them everywhere, but in a hotel on wheels they will be hurried from one city to another in such a way as to afford them an adequate idea of our resources, our mechanical and agricultural industries, our social and political conditions, our educational and commercial progress, our facilities for trade and transportation, and the sources of our wealth, power, and prosperity. The purpose is to make the journey of profit to the people of the United States as well as to their guests, who will include from fifty to sixty of the most distinguished citizens of Central and South America. It is quite as desirable that these gentlemen and the ladies who accompany them should receive social attentions as information concerning the industries of the country; that they should see the homes as well as the factories and farms of our people, our educational and charitable institutions as well as our mills and mines, our systems of State and municipal government, and every feature of our political, social, religious, and commercial life. Each passenger upon the excursion train will be a missionary, and should be impressed with object-lessons.

They come from countries where European continental customs have been inherited and still adhere to domestic and mercantile life, and the ancient prejudices and restrictions of Spain yet exist to a great degree. The equality and freedom of the sexes, the schools for the higher education of women, the dignity of labor, as recognized and encouraged in the United States, will afford them fascinating subjects of study, and will enlarge their moral as well as their mental horizon.

All this is quite as important as the consideration of questions concerning commercial intercourse, which will claim their attention afterward, and of the effect of a free and familiar discussion there can be no doubt. Agitation is always beneficial. Our commerce with Central and South America is reviving, and this fact is due to a stimulated interest. The commission which visited the other continent in 1884-85, and upon whose recommendation the approaching conference is called, brought back much valuable information, which has been given to the people through its reports to Congress, and in the pages of our newspapers and magazines. More has been written and published in the United States concerning the countries south of us during the last four years than in a quarter of a century previous, and the results of this stimulated interest are shown in heavier mails, in the tables of commercial statistics, in the increased passenger traffic upon the few lines of steamships that stagger under burdensome disadvantages, but manage to maintain infrequent communication, and in the recent organization by the merchants of New York city of a commercial association for the expansion of our trade in Spanish America. Our merchants are sending drummers into the southern continent, our manufacturers are studying the requirements of its markets and endeavoring to comply with them, and the members of our Congress have commenced to discuss, if they have not enacted, laws that will relieve the restrictions of trade.

All this has come from agitation. It is the result of diverting the public attention in a direction to which it had not been turned for many years before. Tourists are beginning to visit Central and South America, where they have never gone before, and each returning traveller brings back intelligence that tempts others to follow in his footsteps. The coming conference will greatly increase this new-born interest

and extend the agitation, and the proposed exposition to commemorate the discovery of Columbus will be a great international educator.

The October conference is simply a deliberative body. Its functions are confined to discussions and recommendations, and its results will require legislation and diplomacy to become permanently effective. Upon our Congress rests the great responsibility. Our merchants must have the same facilities that their foreign competitors enjoy to meet them upon an equal footing. It cannot be expected that the people of Latin America will furnish us opportunities that are furnished them by European capital and enterprise. They have already sufficient lines of communication with markets upon the other side of the Atlantic, where their wants are now supplied. They lack nothing in the way of commercial advantages. They have profitable markets for their products, and adequate means of reaching them, which have been established by their customers. They are not seeking our trade, but we are seeking theirs, and to secure it we must employ the same methods that other nations have used.

WILLIAM ELEROY CURTIS.

II.

WHAT MAKES THE ACTOR?

THIS apparently simple question has been put by the writer to many eminent actors and actresses without in any instance eliciting a satisfactory answer. In some cases a more explicit question has been asked, but even when put in this extended form, "What are the qualities of mind and temperament that make the actor?" the replies have been indefinite. Many people whose names are in the front rank of the dramatic profession have clearly stated their inability to give any answer at all. It seems singular that the followers of an art should be unable to point out the necessary foundations for success in their calling, or to explain on what grounds their own popularity rests. Refuge has been taken in the remark that the actor, like the poet, "is born, not made"; but this is an evasion, not a solution. However much the poet may owe to his birth, the intellectual and temperamental gifts that go to the making of poetry are capable of reasonably clear definition. Where the actor differs from the followers of any of the other arts is in the fact that his personal appearance and manner enter largely into his work, and to a considerable extent determine its acceptability. His figure, face, and voice constitute the instrument on which he plays, but, no matter how attractive this may be, the player must possess, in order to be great, the informing ability to draw out the necessary harmonies and make all humanity vibrate in sympathy with them.

Mr. Boucicault, who has probably given as much thought as any living man to all that concerns the stage, said: "The actor's art is purely mimetic. I remember a famous old actor saying to me when looking at a performance: 'Monkeys, my boy; we are all monkeys!' Intellect has not necessarily much to do with acting. I don't think I ever met a man of more moderate intellectual development than the elder Farren, who was famous in *Sir Peter Teazle, Grandfather Whitehead*, etc., etc. Well, when I was going to produce 'London Assurance,' he didn't think there was much in the character of *Sir Harcourt Courtly*. I took him for a walk in Hyde Park and showed him two old beaux. 'Now,' I said, 'I have built *Sir Harcourt* out of materials in those two men. Study them; get them down fine.' He did, and the result was a performance that ranked with the best. Left to himself, Farren would not have evolved anything effective. His talent was entirely mimetic."

But when Mr. Boucicault was asked, "How about the expression of emotions which lie outside the limits of the actor's observations or experiences?" his answer was: "The actor then draws upon his imagination, and mimics or reproduces what he believes to be true." This is an extension of the field of mimicry which might be made to cover a vast amount of ground in many arts. It seems to be purely arbitrary, and not entirely logical. When one of Mr. Boucicault's ability is forced into such apparent paradoxes to explain or defend his theory, it only serves to show the extreme difficulty of forming any theory whatever.

Lawrence Barrett's answer was terse, consisting of these three words: "Sensibility and imagination." Undoubtedly these are requisites, but by no means all that is needed. Sensibility is an admirable quality in an actor, if properly held in check; but too much sensibility will mar the effect of a performance. The actor who yields unreservedly to his own tears or emotions becomes indistinct and inartistic. There are hundreds of people who fancy they would make good actors because their feelings are easily roused. Many young actors and actresses really suffer with the characters they represent, but this does not necessarily make their work appear true to audiences. There is a vast difference between suffering one's self and causing an audience to believe one is suffering. One is nature; the other art; and nature is not usually effective upon the stage. What the French call "the optic of the theatre" makes nature appear distorted and out of perspective and true coloring. For this reason a real tree upon the stage would be to all appearances less real than a painted one. Nature's greens are not vivid before the footlights, but the artist so heightens them that in relation to other things they are made to look brilliant, but yet natural. So it is with acting; the appearance, not the reality, is wanted. Even when the spectator most loses thought of his surroundings in seeing a play, he is still conscious that it is all acting. If he did not have this consciousness, he could not, unless he were an inhuman brute, find pleasure in witnessing the depiction of suffering. And this consciousness of unreality, so necessary to the spectator, is of still greater importance to the actor. In Mr. Archer's recently-published book, "Masks and Faces," the author has been at pains to gather the statements of famous actors as to how much they feel with their characters. The great bulk of the testimony shows that, when emotion is unreservedly yielded to, the performance is ineffective.

A large class of actors and writers about the stage claim that good acting is simply the result of thought and skilful technique. We have lately had in New York one or more distinguished actors of this school, but much as their talents have been admired, the one touch of true feeling that makes the efforts of less finished artists reach the heart has been felt to be wanting. Acting that emanates from the brain only will never rouse the majority of theatre-goers. A highly-cultivated intellect is by no means necessary to theatrical success. Any one who has a large acquaintance with actors will confirm the truth of this statement. Indeed, it is questionable if high intellect and much culture do not as a rule destroy that mobility and plasticity of temperament and bearing which are a part of the tools of a great actor.

"Magnetism" is a word which has of late come into general use to describe the qualities of sympathetic actors. Its employment does not, however, define anything. The grouping of powers under this head makes their origin no more easy to understand than is that of the mysterious force whose name has been given to them. Beauty of face, figure, and voice do not make up magnetism. Several of the most beautiful women on the stage are utter "sticks." Many who are plain to an almost painful degree can play at will on the feelings of their audiences.

An eminent teacher of elocution said: "Acting is the proper conveying of the thoughts of the author. This must be done by speaking his words correctly. Elocution is everything in acting." Such a dogma is contrary to the opinions and experiences of nearly all actors, who believe that what is *done* upon the stage is far more important than what is *said*. Any one who saw "Jim the Penman" will remember that in the crucial moment of the play, when *Mrs. Ralston* discovered that her husband was a forger, not a word was said. Yet, for about two minutes, Mrs. Booth held the spectators breathless by her silent acting. It is possible, perhaps even probable, that in poetic plays and certain tragedies the words may be more important than the action; but this is assuredly not true of the great majority of dramatic representations. Mme. Modjeska, in an interview printed last year, pointed out very clearly the difference between the poetic and the emotional play. She said, in effect, that the poetic play depended upon thought and diction, while the emotional play depended upon action; and she stated that, though she ventured to act *Camille*, this was her only attempt at emotional drama, and that she considered herself purely a poetic actress.

The writer is not rash enough to attempt to define the constituent properties of an art when its own most distinguished followers confess their inability to do so. Possibly, however, this statement of difficulties and diverse opinions may incite thought, and induce some one to grasp and explain the elusive qualities and gifts necessary to the success of the actor.

JULIAN MAGNUS.

III.

IF!

A NEWSPAPER writer, speaking of the late Thomas J. Potter, who, as general manager of the Union Pacific Railway, received an annual salary of $40,000, says that he began his career twenty-five years ago as a lineman on an Iowa railway at $45 per month. "He worked his way up," it is added, from the latter position to the former, "and there is not a young man on any railroad in the United States for whom the same result is not possible, if he should put into his work the same amount of brains and zeal which Mr. Potter did." How inspiring! What a trumpet-call to young railway employees to become, one and all, presidents of great lines, and the recipients of yearly salaries each one of which is in itself a fortune! "*If* he should put into his work," etc. No doubt; and "*if* my aunt had been a man, she would have been my uncle." It is just and only that provoking "if," reader, that prevents a beggar from becoming a Rothschild, or you and me from rivalling Webster at the bar, Gladstone in the senate, or Scott and Dickens in fiction. "If" is a very small word,—a monosyllable of two letters only,—yet how immense is that "If"! Thousands of persons who now languish in obscurity would astonish the world, were they not, like Mirabeau in his youth, confined in the castle of IF.

"If I but had an opening," sighs many a young man in these days of overcrowded professions and multiplying competitors for office and place, "the world should see what I can do." "If I but had an opening!"—as if the very seal and sign of ability —the essential difference between it, or genius, and dilettantism—were not a regal superiority to the "openings" and "opportunities" which so many aspirants to wealth or honor make a condition of success. The successful man is the one who *made* a way when he could not find one; who made the adverse circumstances, over which others were moaning, the ministers and aids to his advancement, instead of becoming their slave. The difficulties which disheartened them only stiffened his sinews; the block of granite which was an obstacle in their pathway became a stepping-stone in his. A lad of twelve years of age, who already played the piano very skilfully, once said to Mozart: "Herr Kapellmeister, I should very much like to compose something. How am I to begin?" "Pho, pho," said Mozart, "you must wait." "But you," said the boy, "composed much earlier." "Yes," replied Mozart, "but *I asked nothing about it.* If one has the spirit of a composer, *one writes because he cannot help it.*" On another occasion, writing in reply to a friend who had asked about his way of composing music, he names certain occasions when his ideas flow best and most abundantly, and adds: "*Whence* and *how* they come I know not, nor can I force them. . . . Why productions take from my hand that particular form and style which makes them *Mozartish*, and different from the works of other composers, is probably owing to the same cause which renders my nose so and so, large or aquiline, or, in short, makes it Mozart's and different from those of other people, for I really *do not study to aim at any originality.*"

The letters of Dickens show that it was in a similar way that he wrote those wondrous novels of his that enchant the world. When a new creation was about to rise from the ocean-depths of thought, he did not go about asking advice, or gird up his literary energies by a prodigious effort of the will, but, to use his own language about "The Chimes," "all his affections and passions got twined and knotted upon it"; he went wandering about at night into the strangest places, "possessed," spirit-driven, a prophet commissioned to utter the life-giving word to men's souls, and finding no rest until he uttered it. So, though rarely perhaps in the same degree, with the eminent men, the great leaders, in almost every calling; they chose

their respective pursuits, if they can be said to have chosen them, not because those pursuits promised the most money, fame, or happiness, but unconsciously, because they could not help it; and they succeeded, not because they resolved with an intense, continuous act of volition to do such and such things, but because they were impelled by a great, prevailing, paramount desire, which engulfed all lesser desires, to do them. No doubt there is a will that makes the man; but if it is not inborn, it cannot be put into him, and it needs no prompting. To tell a young man that he can become a millionaire, a railroad king, etc., etc., "*if* he will put into his work the same amount of brains and zeal" as A or B did before *he* became a millionaire or railroad king, is the veriest drivel. It is equivalent to saying that he will become a Samson if he will only put forth a Samson's strength, or that if an astronomical student will put into his work the mental energy, the spiritual force, of Newton, he will do as great things as Newton—which is not a very stimulating statement, if it be true. How strangely men persist in regarding moral qualities as habits merely, and not gifts! The will is a natural endowment as well as the mental faculties, and to want it is as bad as to want mental power.

WILLIAM MATHEWS.

IV.

THE SLAYER OF J. WILKES BOOTH.

THE WRITER had a personal acquaintance with Boston Corbett, who avenged the death of President Lincoln in so tragic a manner on the night of April 26, 1865.

During the year 1875, while attending a Soldiers' Reunion of Blue and Gray, at Caldwell, Ohio, I first met Mr. Corbett. The town was small and an immense crowd had gathered, General Sherman, among others, being present. Corbett and I were assigned to the same room for the night. I found him a nervous, excitable man, always the centre of attraction, with a keen, but wild, look in his eyes, and an interminable restlessness of body and limb. He was then a preacher, regularly ordained, I think. He led a prayer-meeting in the village church while there. He was always well armed, in self-defence, as he explained, and his experience while at Caldwell showed that he had some reason to fear violence. He got into an exciting argument with several men one afternoon over the question as to whether Booth had really been killed at all. Hot words ensued, a rush was made towards Corbett, and in an instant the gleaming barrel of his revolver flashed in the faces of his opponents. It was with considerable difficulty that they were separated and peace restored.

Corbett claimed to those of us whom he considered his friends that he had been hounded for years by men who were high in authority at Washington at the time of the assassination, and that they caused him to lose several important positions after he went into civil life, and had refused to shake hands with him or to answer his salutation on the streets. The only reason he assigned for this was that his bullet had deprived the Washington authorities of an opportunity to make a grand display in the execution of Booth.

Be this as it may, it is certain that Corbett was always on the watch for bodily harm from some source. During the night I shared a bed with him this was exemplified. It was a close, hot night. We slept on the ground floor, with the window raised. Corbett walked the floor for ten minutes after I was in bed. He would frequently clasp his hands and exclaim: "The Lord have mercy on my soul!" At last he knelt down and offered a fervent prayer, after which he placed a large revolver under his pillow and went to bed. He then told me the whole history of that dark night in Virginia. He said no words could express the resigned hatred, and yet heroic look, of Booth's face as it was lighted up by the flames of the tobacco barn, in which he had taken refuge from his pursuers. To the call for surrender, Booth hurled back words of scorn and defiance, and turned his back on the troops in derision. Corbett said he could stand it no longer, and, although the orders were to take Booth alive, if possible, he raised his revolver and fired. The wound in Booth's head was said to have been within half an inch of the location of Lincoln's fatal wound.

Corbett went to sleep, and I followed later on, with a restless, troubled sleep, in which I dreamed of something which made me awaken Corbett. He sat up in bed, drew out his pistol, and covered me with it. I assured him it was all a dream, and he calmed down again. For several years afterwards I received occasional letters from Mr. Corbett, and he finally drifted to Kansas, where, through the aid of some friends, he was appointed doorkeeper of the House of Representatives during the winter of 1887. While there his mind became seriously affected, and he suddenly appeared in the House one morning with a revolver in each hand, and attempted to kill the Speaker and others. He was promptly removed to the insane asylum.

Early in the year 1887, and while he was in the State House at Topeka, I sent a note to Corbett, asking him to write me an account of the capture and death of Booth, which he did. A copy of his reply is given herewith. I have every reason to think Mr. Corbett's memory was in fair condition when he wrote the article, and it may safely be accepted as a correct narration of the incidents of a dark hour in the nation's history.

R. B. HOOVER.

In camp, at Vienna, Virginia, on the morning of April 15, 1865, the news reached us that President Lincoln had been shot the night before; later news said he was alive, but there was no hope of his recovery. Our regiment (the 6th New York Cavalry) was immediately ordered out in pursuit of the assassin. Deployed as skirmishers, we advanced down to the Potomac River. When near the river, we saw the flag at half-mast on one of the forts, and we knew our President was dead. We returned to camp unsuccessful, but were soon afterward sent to Washington, to go in any direction required to scout for Booth.

Our regiment was soon cut up into detachments, all engaged in the same work, under different leaders, Colonel N. B. Switzer commanding the main body of the men; Major Bosworth, another portion of our command; another party under command of First Lieutenant Ed. P. Doherty, with twenty-six enlisted men, also accompanied by two detectives, to aid in the capture. They had photographs of Booth, Herold, and Surratt.

At the Sixth-Street wharf, we took the steam-tug John S Ide, under Captain Henry Wilson, who conveyed us to Belle Plain, where we landed and at once began the search between the two rivers, Potomac and Rappahannock. At Port Conway the ferryman recognized two of the pictures and said: "These two men crossed my ferry yesterday. Willie, J. H., a confederate officer," he said, "aided them on their way, giving Booth a lift on his horse after crossing the river." We followed the clew given, captured J. H., who was compelled to guide us to the place where he had left the men. Arriving at Garrett's farm, the Lieutenant said to me: "Booth is in that house; ride through the command, and see that every man's pistol is in readiness for use." I did so, and supplied two of our men with caps for their revolvers, who were out of caps.

On entering the premises, we found the men were no longer in the house, but had taken refuge in the barn. A surrender was demanded and refused, Booth declaring that he would not be taken alive. After much parleying Herold concluded to surrender, and was at once put under guard. The tobacco barn was then fired by Conger (the detective), and Booth could then be seen. A single shot from a Colt's revolver brought him down, and the capture was effected. A doctor was sent for, who pronounced the wound fatal. Inside of three hours he was dead. Mr. Conger chose me as an escort, and we started for Belle Plain, and he there took steamer for Washington, and before evening closed the news had flashed over the wires that Booth was taken.

April 26, 1865, was the day when God avenged Abraham Lincoln's death.

Our captive was deposited on the monitor Montauk, at the Navy-Yard at Washington.

During the interval of our different scouts, I attended prayer-meeting one night at Wesley Chapel. The leader said: "Brother Corbett, lead us in prayer." I prayed:

"O Lord, lay not innocent blood to our charge; but bring the guilty speedily to punishment." Afterward, when the assassin lay at my feet, a wounded man, and I saw the bullet had taken effect about an inch back of the ear, and I remembered that Mr. Lincoln was wounded about that part of the head, I said: "What a God we serve! I little thought, when I offered that prayer a week ago, that it would be answered in this way."

BOSTON CORBETT,
Late Serg't Co. L, 16th N. Y. Cavalry.

Written at Topeka, Kansas, January 19, 1887.

V.

AN EMERGENCY THAT DEMANDS A WORD.

I FIND MYSELF in hearty accord with the writer who recently suggested in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW that there should be an American Academy of Language established for the purpose of determining that the growth of the English language in America shall proceed along scientific lines and with a scientific basis. The language is bound to grow. As

"New occasions teach new duties,"

so new objects, new ideas, new inventions, demand new words. Shall these things be left to whim, or chance, or the happy-go-lucky choosing of an inventor who has no true conception of the way in which words ought to be formed or selected? It would seem that there are enough monstrosities in the language already, and that the time has come for more rational action in the future. The establishing of an Academy of Language, in which all the colleges and higher educational institutions, and all the learned societies, should have representatives, would undoubtedly be a wise and conservative movement. Its authority would speedily vindicate itself. In all probability the newspapers, which are mainly instrumental in giving currency to words, would gladly accept the decisions of this tribunal and consent to employ in their columns no words that had not received the stamp of official approval.

I am led to these reflections by the necessity which has arisen for some word to express the process by which a convict will be killed when he is executed by the new law in New York State, which provides for the use of electricity as a substitute for the hangman's noose. The word "execution," by a process of restriction which is common in language, has come to mean simply hanging. Strictly speaking, of course, it is the law which is executed, not the man, and there are some purists who still insist that this is the only proper use of the word. So under the new method we shall still speak of execution when the murderer is—*what?* That is the question. Here, if the Academy of Language were in existence, would be a splendid opportunity for it to rise to the occasion and meet this—not long-felt, but—pressing want. Various "words" have been invented by various newspaper writers to fit the present case, but none of them seems to "fill the bill" exactly. Of all the suggestions, the palm for barbarism that is absolutely soul-harrowing must be assigned to "electrocution," with its companions in misery, "electrocute" and "electrocuted." May some good angel intervene and save the English-American language from such a blight! This emergency ought to arouse our people generally to the need that undeniably exists for some unquestioned authority which might be looked to in cases of this sort for a decision at once wise, rational, and common-sensible. Whether the proposed method of "execution" is a success or not, there will be not a little gained if the want of a word to designate the operation should lead to the establishment of such an institution as the writer referred to in my opening sentence would like to see established. At all events, I am very glad to second his motion with great heartiness, and with a profound and growing conviction that the need of prudent and sagacious direction of the growth and development of a language is imperative.

KINGDON MEREDITH.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXCV.

SOUTH END

OCTOBER, 1889.

THE WARNING OF THE ENGLISH STRIKES.

BY HENRY GEORGE.

How it may come that the New Zealander shall yet sit and meditate on the broken arch of London Bridge, the strike of the London dock laborers gives something like a suggestion.

War is the great destroyer. Of all wars, civil war is most destructive. Of all civil wars, that which rages, not between different sections of the same country, but between different classes in the same territory. And most destructive of all civil wars of this kind is that waged in great cities.

Such strikes as that in London are in reality incipient civil war of this kind. Passions that make man the most destructive of animals are aroused. They find expression, it is true, only in passive, not in active form—in refraining rather than in doing. But it is like superheated water, which, so long as confined, retains its liquid form. Once let the pressure be relieved, and with explosive force it flashes into steam.

Consider the spectacle that the banks of the lower Thames have presented for some weeks past. The wheels of industry blocked, commerce paralyzed, perishable cargoes rotting, ships unable to go to sea, trade driven away, enormous losses going on, ordered armies of tens and scores of thousands parading, great

bodies of men fed by public rations—for the time it could hardly have been worse if the Channel fleet had been annihilated and Continental squadrons blocked the river's mouth.

Yet law and order have reigned throughout. The forces that keep the peace are strong in London. The police are numerous, of splendid physique, and well disciplined, and large bodies of the flower of the regular army are constantly in reserve. And the leaders of the strikers have used their influence to prevent violence. But what has been going on in London is nevertheless war—a contest in which both parties have been trying to inflict loss and injury on each other, counting for success on doing so. Only passive war, it is true; a contest of endurance, not of physical force. But the war spirit was there—the sense of injury and feeling of animosity; the passion that leads to the taking of life and destruction of property. And the danger was there. It needs but an accident to convert passive into active energy. Burns said two weeks ago that his influence alone had prevented the firing of London in several places.

Greatest of great cities, the world's metropolis, Babylon of Babylons, yet steadily growing with accelerated rapidity, London is to-day what New York and Chicago and St. Louis and San Francisco promise to become; the type towards which all great cities tend. It is in London of all places on earth that one may see and feel the strength and weakness of modern civilization, its glory and its shame, the high possibilities it is opening, and the explosive forces it is generating. There is London and London, it is true—the London of society, of science, of politics, of religion, of philanthrophy, of business, of amusement. And he who has password and key may see one London and be hardly conscious of the existence of any other. But there is also the London of hard strain and bitter pinching, of want and misery, of vice and degradation.

And if one strives to realize what the whole great city is and what it holds, the streets of London are the place where it may most clearly be seen that the tendencies of modern civilization are towards catastrophe; and that, as Macauley saw, the Huns and Vandals that may be yet to come, will come not from without, but from within.

A few weeks ago I stood in New Bond Street before a painting in a dealer's window. It was by a noted painter, Moscheles, but

of an every-day scene. Not only an every-day scene in London, but in New York and other great cities. In the background fine shops, with the passers and loiterers one sees in fashionable retail streets; at the curb a private carriage, the liveried coachman erect on his box and a fur-caped footman springing to open the door for a richly-dressed lady coming out of a jeweller's establishment. In the foreground, three sandwich-men tramping along.

I noted for a few minutes those who stopped. They glanced at this picture a moment, and then, as though it were too familiar for attention, turned to picture of mountain or seacoast, of fruits or flowers, or the graceful female form. A man with high-lettered hat and long oilcloth coat all printed over glanced in a moment from his handing out of circulars. I asked him what the picture was. It was a picture advertising a theatre, he said.

It was more. Into this picture of familiar things the painter, with the subtle power that is in his art, had put the problem of modern civilization. Underneath it, a piece of cardboard bore the legend, "In the year of our Lord, 1889!"

Almost twenty centuries; and in the greatest and richest of Christian cities, whence missionaries are sent to Asia, to Africa, to the islands of the sea, human labor is cheapest of commodities, and man, "the roof and crown of things," is turned into a sign-post! It is this paradox and problem that this London strike brings out.

This strike of dock laborers is, in many respects, the most remarkable of the industrial conflicts which in recent years have been so many; remarkable because of the class of men embraced, the endurance manifested, and the sympathy excited, and for the growing ideas and new influences it discloses.

The London dock laborers consist of a small class who have something like steady employment, and a larger class of casuals who are taken on by the hour as needed. The work being unskilled labor, the London docks have been the last chance of unemployed men physically able to do such work. It is at their gates that the pressure for employment has most strikingly shown itself. Around them have gathered every morning thousands of men—men with hungry wives and children, men who had walked the streets all night, or got what rest they could in alley-ways, beneath railway arches, in doorways, or behind boxes—waiting the appearance of the contractors or dock foremen to pick out

those to be set to work, and then pressing, scrambling, fighting for the chance like hungry dogs for a bone. Journals like the *Pall Mall Gazette* have made their readers familiar with these scenes, not merely by pen-pictures of onlookers, but by accounts from men who have gone amid the crowds and struggled for work; and sympathy has been excited which has shown itself substantially during this strike.

But for this deep and wide sympathy the dock laborers would have been unable to maintain a strike for more than a few days, if even beyond a single day. Besides the contributions that have flowed in through newspapers and directly to the committees, every parade and public meeting has been made a means of collecting money from the crowds, some £400, mostly in pennies, having been taken in at the Hyde Park demonstration; and the streets in the East End have been scoured by strikers' collectors, who accosted every passer and boarded every omnibus. Besides the contributions of money—in which far-off Australia bore the palm—the shopkeepers in the vicinity of the docks made liberal donations in kind, even the pawnbrokers having reduced or waived interest on articles pawned by strikers or their wives. The Salvation Army soup-houses reduced their prices to strikers and their families one-half at the first, and afterward, I believe, dealt out food on ticket without charge.

All the charitable and religious societies working in the east of London seem, in the same spirit, to have done what they could to assist and support the strikers. Pressure has been brought to bear on the dock directors by city business men to induce them to yield, while the religious elements working to the same end included such extremes as General Booth, of the Salvation Army, the skirmishers, so to speak, of the low wing of the Established Church, and the Bishop of London, its official local head; Albert Spicer, the leading Congregational layman; and Cardinal Manning, the foremost representative of English Catholicism.

Perhaps even more striking than all this—at least even more ominous to "things as they are"—is the fact that the policemen detailed to march with the first procession of strikers subscribed among themselves to pay for a band, and that the guards in their barracks at Birdcage Walk cheered the Hyde Park procession as it passed. It was when the French guards sided with the mob that the Bastile fell. And when the day comes that policemen refuse to

club and soldiers to shoot men to whom they are bound not merely by human but by class sympathy, the guarantees of the existing order, on which all over Europe the House of Have so confidently leans, are gone.

It would be a mistake to suppose that all this sympathy which has enabled penniless, unskilled men to hold out for a month is merely sympathy with poverty and suffering, such as might go out to victims of flood or fire. It is something more. It has in it the feeling—ranging from uneasy suspicion to passionate conviction—that the dock laborers are victims of social injustice. It has in it, in large degree, a desire to do more than to help the dock laborers—the desire to raise the spirit and promote social discontent among the most downtrodden of the English people. And it is as an evidence of the growth of such discontent that this strike is most significant. It is in this respect far more significant than any of the strikes of the skilled trades.

An English politician of the first rank, then a cabinet minister, said to me some years ago: "In spite of its shocking contrasts, the existing order of things is secure in England. Go to the entrance of the park of an afternoon in the season. There you will see in long procession the utmost extravagance of luxury, the very ostentation of wealth. Look at the faces of the poorer people crowded together to watch the show. You will not find in them the expression of envy or hatred, the consciousness that their robbery provides this luxury, but of pure admiration. This is really the feeling of one extreme towards the other. The poor admire the rich. The man who cannot find work does not feel bitterly towards the great landlord or capitalist, but towards the man whose competition he thinks is depriving him of employment. The man who has three shillings a day envies only the man who has three and sixpence. And so through all gradations of society, each class is more than content to see others above it, because of the conscious superiority with which it looks down on those beneath it."

This is, indeed, the strength of the existing order. But this keen observer made, I think, the same mistake as one who, from the temper of the crowds that watched the carriages rolling from Paris to Versailles something over a century ago, had argued the permanence of the ancient régime. And though he is doubtless

now of the same opinion as when he thus spoke, yet during the seven years that have passed strong influences have been at work beneath the surface of British politics and society. On the one hand, a recognition of the fundamental injustice which denies to the great body of the British people their natural, equal, and unalienable right to the use of British soil, and makes the element on which and from which all must live the private property of some, has spread widely and deeply. On the other hand, socialism has been making way. The two things are widely different and in some respects antagonistic, but both foster social discontent.

And beneath all this is the effect of compulsory education, of the extension of the franchise, of cheap newspapers and cheap books, of the efforts that have been making to improve the intelligence, the morality, the physical well-being of the poor—from the teetotal movement, the Salvation Army, and the People's Palace, to the flower missions and the taking of children from the slums for a month, a week, or a day in the country, there giving them glimpses that forever after make them dissatisfied with what before seemed natural because it was all they knew.

None of these agencies have yet completed their work ; they are only beginning it. The board schools have not yet been in operation for twenty years. The only really radical half-penny paper is but two years old. The system of registration which disfranchises great bodies of workingmen, and the property suffrage which gives to richer men two, four, and six votes apiece, still prevents democratic strength from fairly showing itself. And the generation is not yet fairly on the stage in which other ameliorative influences will tell.

But the steady, ofttimes cruel, work of school boards and truant officers in driving even hungry children to school is beginning to show in the decadence of local dialects and the disappearance of illiteracy. The *Star* has a circulation of over two hundred thousand. John Burns, the leader of this strike, is a member of the County Council, on which peers of the realm are glad to sit, while candidates for office find it to their interest to show sympathy and send money to the strikers.

Let it be granted, as some contend, with an air of thus settling all social problems, that the condition of the masses is, on the whole, growing better. Man is not an ox for whom any standard of contentment can be fixed ; who, given so much food

and drink, will fill his stomach and chew the cud. His desires grow by what they feed on; are aroused by glimpses of new gratifications. According to De Tocqueville, it is when things are growing better, not when they are growing worse, that revolutions come. This at least is certain: that hope is an essential element in the social discontent that shatters institutions. American slaveholders were right when, in the interests of the "peculiar institution," they made it a crime to teach a slave to read, and sought as far as possible to prevent his seeing or hearing of a free black.

Each year as it passes is making English thought and English conscience more restive under existing social conditions; is making more certain either peaceful readjustment or blind and forcible revolt. Between these two every one of any influence must take his choice. If he will not aid the one, he is helping on the other.

As I write, pulsing flashes in the cable mirror have told the western world that the strike is ended and London breathes free again. After a month's strife the Cardinal whom men know only to reverence and love, and whose strength in meekness has been abated neither by years nor by Rome's purple, has effected a compromise.

Think of it. So has our civilization soared that what happened in London when the sun was sinking is told in New York ere the shadows have more than begun to lengthen. Think of what advances in the arts of production this suggests. Then think of what this London strike so forcibly brings out—that in the distribution of wealth we are in reality no further advanced than when barbarian fought barbarian.

We girdle the earth; we weigh the stars; we rule scales to the hundred-thousandth of an inch; we make instruments so delicate that they record and give back again the finest inflections of human speech. Yet when it comes to dividing the product of their joint exertion between labor and capital, we have nothing better than

> "The good old plan,
> That they should get who have the power, and they should keep who can."

The London strike is over. There was war. There is a truce. And with the next quarrel war will begin again.

The lesson of this London strike! What is it but the lesson of the strikes and lock-outs in the Illinois coal-fields; of the New York freight-handlers' strike; of the Chicago strike, out of which

grew the explosion of the Haymarket bomb and the hanging of the Anarchists; of the southwestern railroad strike; of the Pittsburg riots—the lesson of all strikes, coming sharper and clearer as the years go on? It is the lesson that the social problem cannot be ignored; that unless the moral advance of our civilization is commensurate with its intellectual and material advances, civilization itself is doomed. A civilization in which the arts of production advance by leaps and bounds, and distribution is left to war, though but passive war, is like an Eiffel Tower standing on one leg. The higher we carry it the more certain the final crash. That is what we are doing here in the United States, as there in great Britain. And every year it becomes more dangerous.

For every year society becomes integrated, industry more complex and interdependent, and the stoppage of one function more likely to involve and paralyze others. You may cut a worm in two, and both pieces will live. But a bodkin's touch in a vital place, and your man is dead.

The loss caused by the London strike is estimated at from two to three million pounds. Had it continued in its highest intensity during the whole time, the loss would have been much greater. Had the stevedores and the wharfmen and the coal-handlers stayed out as long as the dock laborers, every factory in London and its neighborhood might have been closed. As it was, coal rose to forty-five shillings a ton, mail steamers were delayed for days, excursion steamers with full passenger lists had to give up engagements, while colliers, turning back, literally carried coals to Newcastle. The gas stokers refused to come out when asked, for they had just won a concession on a threatened strike of their own, and sent a donation instead. Supposing they had not won the concession, and had come out, and left London in darkness but for a night—London, where no man knows his neighbor; London, with its army of thieves and vagrants; its public houses certain in such case to be sacked, and their spigots set flowing ere the peal of twelve! The manifesto of the strike leaders calling on all workmen to stop work fell flat. But supposing it had been followed in only a few of the more vital occupations, as at a time when the strike spirit was more rife it might have been, what would have been the loss? and the danger?

As it is, the strike has cost from ten to fifteen millions of our money, to speak of no more than money cost. What has it set-

tled ? There is a gain in some ways, but nothing is settled. The dock companies will hesitate before refusing the next demand that involves a strike, and other employers will be warned by their loss. But on the other hand, the substantial success of this strike will prompt to others. The question of division between employer and employed is still left to force ; the labor question, the question of questions for our civilization, is untouched.

See precisely what has been the gain. Fresh spirit has been infused into a downtrodden body of workers, and the social question again forced on public attention for the warning of those who have eyes to see and ears to hear ; the Socialists have made a gain, and their propaganda will go on with more ardor and zeal than ever; and a considerable body of the strikers will, for a while at least, have better wages and more permanent work. But the dock companies will employ fewer casuals. So far from any vent being opened for the mass of unskilled unemployed labor constantly congregating in London, such poor vent as the docks afforded will be narrowed, perhaps closed, for some of the dock companies do not employ casuals.

This is the hopelessness of trades-unions and strikes, so far as any settlement of the labor question is concerned. It is like leveeing a river subject to flood. Every levee that is raised requires constant watching, and every new levee increases the pressure on all. Nay, the illustration is hardly strong enough. For the rise of the water also increases the swiftness of the current that carries it off. But the restrictions with which trades-unions keep each their own little territory from inundation by unemployed labor do not add to the facility with which that labor finds employment.

Am I, then, opposed to strikes ? My answer would be, No ! A strike is the necessary weapon of the trades-union, and without it the trades-union would be of as little effect as a prohibitory act without a penal clause. I believe, as I have never neglected an opportunity of telling workingmen, that trades-unions can accomplish nothing large and permanent, and that the method of raising wages by strikes is the method of main strength and stupidity. But I also believe that trades-unions and strikes, and especially among such a class as the London dock laborers, may so raise the spirit of men, so, temporarily at least, improve their condition, as to enable them to act in a more promising line. There is

no hope from the very poor. They are as dangerous as the very rich.

The organization of the dock laborers in Glasgow and Belfast,* which preceded the London strike and won considerable concessions, was initiated by Scottish single-tax men, and the money which enabled the Glasgow strikers to hold out until they brought the employers to terms was advanced by an English single-tax man. These men look on labor organizations and their necessary weapon, the strike, merely as a means for infusing heart and hope into a downtrodden class, and so improving their condition that they may be able to see in the monoply of the natural element of all production the real cause of the unnatural competition in the labor market, and in the restoration of equal rights in the soil, the simple remedy to be applied through the ballot. The London organization and strike seems to have been initiated and managed by Socialists, though supported by all who have sympathy with the condition of the laborer, and brought to a final close by the offices of Cardinal Manning.

Nor do the thorough-going Socialists hope by mere trades-unionism and sporadic strikes to accomplish more than preparatory work. In fact, they are opposed to trades-unionism as it has developed in Great Britain and in the United States, as forming an aristocracy of labor, which prevents the union they deem essential. What they are bent on is such a general and universal organization of labor as will enable labor to appropriate all the tools and means of production, to control all industry, abolish competion, and do away with the wage system by putting every one on the pay-roll. It must have been a glad Saturday afternoon to them when the manifesto calling for a general strike in London was issued. The hope proved delusive, but for a few hours at least they must have thought that the time long waited for had come.

Now that I have answered the question, some readers would like to ask, Let me put one. I would like to ask the intelligent,

* One of them being a system of pay ticket, cashable in certain public houses, at the price of taking a drink I have been struck in England and Scotland by the number of ardent teetotalers who are working for social reform, Burns, by the bye, being a strict temperance man. The temperance people who imagine that could drinking be abolished poverty would cease, in large degree mistake cause for effect; but that every advance in temperate habits among the working classes does increase both the disposition and the power to overthrow the conditions that produce poverty is clear.

well-to-do people, of whom the readers of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW on both sides of the Atlantic are so largely composed—the professors, clergymen, doctors, and lawyers, the bankers, merchants, manufacturers, and capitalists—whether they are in favor of strikes. I do this because on both sides of the Atlantic the influence of this class is, in the main, passively or actively exerted in favor of strikes.

I know that there is a good deal of gush about profit-sharing as preventing strikes, or arbitration as taking their place, talked by, or rather to, this class,—for they, and not workingmen, are its consumers. But this amounts to nothing, unless it be to the admission that organization among workingmen, with some method of enforcing their "reasonable" demands, is, in the nature of things, necessary. The profit-sharers assume that all employers have profits, and that wages called by another name would cease to be wages. The believers in arbitration assume that men who have the power of enforcing their demands will consent to submit them to arbitration, or they vaguely contemplate some kind of courts which will have power to compel employers to pay wages they do not wish to pay and workingmen to work when and where they do not want to. This is the only sort of arbitration that would prevent strikes, for all human law rests ultimately on force, and though a league of nations might put an end to international war, it could only be on the condition that the power of the league should be turned against the nation that refused to obey the mandate of its tribunal. The profit-sharers and the arbitrationists ought to go to the Socialists, where they belong, for the State Socialists, with their organization of all industry and fixing of all prices, are the thorough-going profit-sharers and arbitrationists. Indeed, they are there already, for they are, in fact, but rose-water Socialists.

There are also those who condemn strikes with the confidence and vigor of men who, from premises in which essential facts are suppressed, argue, by logical methods, to false conclusions. They say that it is the right of every employer to employ, and of every workman to work for, whom he pleases and on what terms he pleases, and that while workmen have an unquestioned right to stop work individually, they have no right to combine to force others to stop. These men have shut eyes for boycotting by employers, but are alive to the wickedness of boycotting by workmen.

Against combinations of capitalists to freeze out business rivals, to blackmail and rob under forms of law, they have little or nothing to say, but are bold as lions in inveighing against the violation of personal liberty by labor combinations. Though there is an implied falsehood in their premises, the vigor with which they push to their conclusions is better than the weak tea of the shilly-shally school. But their day both in Great Britain and in the United States is gone, and what influence they may exert on workingmen is the opposite of what they wish.

But the position of the main body of the class I speak of, as shown in press, pulpit, and university teaching, has, in certain fashion, advanced beyond that of the ultras who would put down strikes and substitute nothing. Generally it regards strikes as all right if not carried too far, or, at least, as a necessary evil. Not merely is the influence of this most influential class mainly exerted to prevent the spread of ideas that aim at something better, but it acquiesces in and fosters ideas that look to restriction, regulation, and interference as the only way of doing anything for workingmen.

I have not space to point out how in England the real strength of socialism comes from the upper rather than from the lower classes, but in some respects this is obvious. A committee of peers, the chairman being Lord Dunraven, has been for some time taking testimony in regard to the sweating system. The character of the measures they will propose is clear in advance. To cure evils caused by restriction they will propose more restrictions; the enforcement by law of such prohibitions and regulations as trades-unions try to enforce by combinations and strikes. Michael Davitt raised in Ireland the cry of the land for the people. How have the ruling class striven to head off the agitation thus begun? By gross interferences with what they declare to be the rights of property, by stepping in between man and man and fixing prices. And that not sufficing, by furnishing one particular class with capital to buy farms at the cost and risk of the whole body of taxpayers. What is the difference in principle between supplying Irish tenants with money to buy farms and supplying English operatives with money to buy factories, or London costermongers with money to buy donkeys? And since the purse of government is only the purse of taxpayers, since governments produce nothing, but can merely give with one

hand what they take with the other, what is the difference, save as a matter of adjustment, between furnishing money to buy these things and the simpler plan of taking them from one set of men and handing them over to another? The difference between thorough-going State Socialists like Mr. Hyndman and the majority of Parliament is not of direction, but of degree. And in this country the same tendency may be seen. What is our protectionism but a form of socialism?

The great loss of the London strike falls on non-combatants. This is the case with all such strikes, and increasingly. And designedly. Just as towns are bombarded to make garrisons capitulate, so it is the true policy of strikers to make the general public feel injuriously their opponents' obstinacy.

As to strikes being all right so long as they do not involve force, why, all strikes in occupations which unemployed labor can enter must involve force of some kind. This London strike—thanks largely to Mr. Burns, who is really a superior man, and of whom I remember saying to my companion when, some five years ago, I first met him, that if he lived he would be heard of, and thanks to such men as Cardinal Manning, to say nothing of the police—has been, by all accouuts, a most decorous and well-bred strike. Nevertheless there was something that kept men who would have been glad to take the places of the strikers from applying for work, and I read in a London paper of a train of meat wagons, which the strikers' pickets mistakenly thought had come from the docks, being compelled to turn back. Did the drivers turn back merely because they feared the pickets would feel bad if they passed on?

Are strikes necessary? Under present conditions in which the opportunity of employment is a privilege, in which men talk and think of those who "furnish work" as benefactors, they are inevitable, and must increase in magnitude and intensity. When wealth is concentrating in great blocks, when capital is combining in all directions, the growing intelligence and increasing aspirations of the laboring masses will not permit them to be crowded to the wall without struggling. Under these conditions strikes can only be prevented by laws which will destroy liberty and put aside the rights of property. But is there no alternative?

What is the real justification of the strike, both in the minds of the men who engage in it and in the minds of those who support

it? Is it not that the men who thus try to force their employers have no power to employ themselves?

What more obvious, stated nakedly, than that, while all men have a right to work or not to work as they see fit, no one has a right to prevent any one else from working, and that no one has a right in any way to force another to employ him or to compel him to assent to the terms of such employment. Yet declare this, as applicable under present conditions to mere laborers in London or New York, and you but mock them. For to say nothing of the minor restrictions and taxations which prevent men from working, our treatment of the natural basis of all work is one which prevents men from working.

Go up in imagination, as it were in a balloon, above London or New York, or any city in which unemployed men are struggling for work, or preventing others from working in order to compel some poor little advance in wages. Look down, as it were, from a height.

What is man, the animal who builds cities, and excavates docks, and lays wires under the ocean, and drives ships over it? Is he not a land animal, whose very body is composed of land? What is his production but the bringing-forth on land of materials drawn from land, by moving, combining, separating them so as to satisfy his desires? Look, and in every direction see land half used or not used at all. Why should there be any scarcity of work; why should men willing to work suffer and strain for want of the things that work produces, while land, the natural source and means of all production, is so abundant? There is no reason in the nature of things. The reason is simply that the natural element on which all men must live and work, if they are to live and work at all, is by human law made the exclusive property of some men, who thus can and do prevent other men from working, and rob them of the produce of their work.

Here is the root of the social problem, of all the paradoxes of our modern civilization.

The lesson of the London strike—it seems to me to be that modern society has but the choice between the single tax and socialism, between justice and war.

HENRY GEORGE.

PROGRESS AND THE POST.

BY THE HON. DON M. DICKINSON, EX-POSTMASTER-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE household, the farm, the shop, the office, the counting-house, the factory, and the mine, and all political, social, and economic relations of our people, have come to be so dependent upon certain, free, and quick communication that they must speedily demand of Congress two radical reforms in postal administration : the one, through a readjustment, if not a recreation, of the fundamental law of the post-office establishment, to suit the entire change in conditions since its organization, and to train into its proper orbit this enormous and unwieldly eccentric among American institutions ; the other, a revision of the patchwork of exigent legislation on the subject of carrying the mails, and a fuller exercise of the constitutional power of Congress, too long neglected, over the whole matter of the transportation and transmission of intelligence.

The postal service has long since outgrown the organic law of the establishment.

The scheme of a department as adopted by the fathers substantially followed the colonial plan as practised by Franklin, who, in the language of the act of Parliament creating the office of Postmaster-General for the colonies, which he held, was "to keep his chief letter office in New York, and other chief offices at some convenient place or places in other of Her Majesty's provinces and colonies in America." As late as 1836, when the business of the whole service in the United States had not reached, in gross receipts, a volume equal to that of the average wholesale New York merchant of to-day, the Congress considered the Postmaster-General as the chief postmaster in all the post-offices, and the officers corresponding to those now called postmasters as his "deputies."

At the time of the adoption of the Constitution the gross business did not equal forty thousand dollars, and when the department was organized the total expenditures were less than ninety thousand dollars per annum. The tradition is not beyond belief, therefore, that Benjamin Franklin in 1753, if not in 1775,* carried the entire general archives of this executive office in his hat or his breast-pocket; nor is it to be wondered at, considering the then conditions, the concentrated population, the small business, and the primitive methods of communication, that the founders of the government should have adopted the theory that the whole concern, in general and in detail, might be efficiently conducted by one man with a force of clerks. This is still the fundamental plan of the system, and it has become as unfitting as the swaddling-clothes of a babe to the form of a giant. Its misapplication to a growing service became apparent as early in 1814, when the House of Representatives appointed a committee "to inquire into the expediency of revising the laws regulating the general post-office establishment of the United States, and so amending them as to render them more conformable than they are at present to the principles of the Constitution."

At that time the gross revenue of the department had reached the sum of but seven hundred and thirty thousand dollars annually; there were two thousand six hundred and seventy-four post-offices, and forty-one thousand seven hundred and thirty-six miles of post routes. In view of the present conditions, when our leading offices in cities each transact from double to five times the entire postal business of the nation of that period; when there are sixty thousand postmasters, and one hundred and seventy thousand persons engaged in the service, and its cost is upwards of sixty-six millions; and in view of the fact that the law as then complained of still remains practically unchanged, the emphasis and vigor with which these figures are used to support the resolution make the debate upon it now read like a page from Gulliver.

The mover of the resolution declared that it was an alarming feature that during four several Presidential terms of office the number of the Postmaster-General's subalterns "have reached three thousand persons, who, under another head of this depart-

* Chosen Postmaster-General by the Continental Congress in 1775.

ment, and another order of things, might be planted as the worst emissaries for the worst purposes over the United States of America"; and that, if he did not abuse his place with this great power, it was a proof that the then Postmaster-General was a purer man than the speaker "ever knew or heard or read of." He pointed to the concentration of power in this one man as a great and dangerous evil, from which he apprehended that the time would come "when honorable Senators or other elevated men might be diverted, perverted possibly, from their duties by hopes allowed to be entertained that a postmaster may be prevailed on to translate them from their public places to others of less dignity, but more emolument," and that "unless some remedy be applied, and that without delay, we are in danger of a new order of Jesuits in this country, with an unlimited general at their head to dictate his orders, and enforce them under all the pains and penalties of removal from their deputations." He closed the debate with the demand that "the post-office establishment be put on the footing of all other departments of the general government." And in this he voiced a sentiment which the absolute need of the service, as well as the principles of a free government, must force upon the attention of a modern Congress. Eighteen years later, on the floor of the House, Edward Everett called marked attention "to the vast and expensive establishment the post-office has become," and presented what was evidently a startling array of figures of the cost of the service in these words :

"The expense at which it is supported for the year ending July, 1832, amounted to the large sum of two million two hundred and sixty-six thousand one hundred dollars, of which two million two hundred and fifty-eight thousand five hundred and seventy dollars were actually levied in the form of postage within the last year. The entire expense of the navy of the United States is but three million three hundred and seventy-nine thousand dollars, and that of the whole civil list, foreign intercourse, and miscellaneous department of the Government is but a trifle over three million."

And so on the floor of the Senate in the previous year, when post-office matters were under consideration, vigorous and warning comment was made by a Senator on "the immense influence of an army of dependents amounting to more than ten thousand men."

The attempt at revision amounted to nothing, and since the creation of the office of third assistant postmaster-general in 1836, who, with the first and second assistants, was, until 1853,

directly appointed by the Postmaster-General, and subject to removal by him,* there has been no distribution of powers or redistribution of functions from 1794 until the present time.

The whole body of statutes, following the old theory of organization, has provided and continues to provide, in terms, that the head of the department shall perform the functions necessary to the postal service, leaving the organization, and the assignment of parts and duties of all subalterns, to be fixed by his regulations and orders. Clerks have been added from time to time, who have no direct responsibility save to him, and it is even contemplated by Congress to supplement the present acreage of departmental buildings, in order to provide accommodations for an ever-increasing army of departmental employees; in persistent adherence to the primitive scheme, as clearly outgrown as population, material wealth, and all conditions of the current period have outgrown those of one hundred years ago. Could the men of 1814 and 1831–'32, instinct with the principle of local self-government, freshly endowed with its blessings, and alert to defend it from dangers, have foreseen the settlement of the country and the present proportions of the postal service, nothing could have withstood their determination to bring this governmental agency, now so nearly affecting every citizen, close to and in touch with the people.

The cost of the entire service in 1840 was about four millions and a half; less than one-eighth of what the head of the department now pays out on his contracts for the carrying of the domestic mails alone. In 1850 the gross expenditure was a little over five millions, or about equal to the present business of the New York city office. In 1860 it was a little over nineteen millions; in 1870, a little over twenty-three millions; in 1880, about thirty-six and a half millions; and for the year ending June 30, 1890, the estimate submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury places the expenditures at nearly sixty-seven millions. There are employed in the service more than one hundred and seventy thousand persons. At the close of this fiscal year there will be sixty thousand post-offices and postmasters. The cost of our service is about double that of Great Britain and France combined, exclus-

* The duties of these officials, although they now hold commissions of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, are still prescribed by the Postmaster-General.

ive of the cost of their telegraph service. It is twelve to fifteen millions of dollars in excess of that of the German Empire, including the cost of their telegraph service. We handle more than double the pieces of mail matter of Germany and France combined, and over a million and a quarter of pieces more than Great Britain. For the year ending June 30, 1888, not including carrier routes in cities, the length of the mail routes in the United States was four hundred and three thousand nine hundred and seventy-six miles, while those of Germany were eighty-six thousand miles, of Great Britain, forty-five thousand miles, and of France, sixty-six thousand miles. For the same period our mail transportation service covered upwards of two hundred and eighty-seven millions of miles.

The money-order system did not go into operation until November 1, 1864, and the balance-sheet of the business done by this division of the department shows a total business of disbursements and receipts for the year 1888 of nearly two hundred and sixty-five million dollars. Postage-stamps were first used under the act of March, 1847, and stamped envelopes in 1853. In 1888 the department issued nearly two billions of stamps and nearly five hundred million stamped envelopes. Postal-cards were not issued until May 1, 1873, and in 1888 there were issued by the department about four hundred millions. The first of the registry system was July 1, 1855, and in 1888 there were registered about fourteen million pieces of matter. Free delivery service was established July 1, 1863, and the appropriation by Congress to defray its cost for the present fiscal year is eight million dollars.

These are but a few of the general heads of greater magnitude in the affairs of this branch of the government, the details of all the annual transactions of which, in the most concise form, now require, in the report to Congress, an 8vo volume of one thousand pages.

The business has to do with every city, village, hamlet, and home in the land; the field of its performance is our vast territory between the two oceans, populated everywhere. No agency of government, State, national, or municipal, so touches the individual citizen in domestic affairs and in his going and in his coming. He depends upon it for public intelligence and for private information; in his home life and in his vocations. As there are varieties in customs, business, habits,

and occupations in a nation of widely-separated communities,—a truth at the foundation of American free government,—so the wants of our people as to the transmission and delivery of intelligence are in like manner diversified. It is an essential element in the principle of home rule, as applied here, that such agencies of the government as have most directly to do with the every-day affairs of men should be placed nearest the people as they live and move at home. This consummation is more readily attained, when practicable, by choosing the agent, or public functionary, from among the people to be served; but this is only an aid in reaching the object, which is satisfied when power is quickly receptive of knowledge of wants and of wrongs, and fully equipped promptly to supply the one and remedy the other. Although the other departments of the government in the country at large have more to do with special classes than with the people generally, yet in every case where their business touches the people of localities, they have their divisions of territory, with chiefs clothed with ample power, in the first instance, and in all details, to exercise their respective functions of administration. The Treasury has its customs collector, its district internal-revenue officers, and its sub-treasurers; the Land Office its district officers; the Pension Office its pension agents; the Indian Office its Indian agents; the Department of Justice, its district attorneys and marshals, and the War Office its department commanders.

In the postal service alone is there no one, save the Postmaster-General in his chief office at Washington, in general authority anywhere throughout the wide territory and the different divisions of the service. We have the local postmaster, but his power ceases when he has performed his function of receiving and distributing the mails. He is responsible to and reports directly to the Postmaster-General at Washington. He cannot remove a letter-carrier without the sanction of that officer. He can remedy no failure of transmission, nor can he expedite it. There are superintendents of divisions in the railway mail service, but they have only to do with the transportation of the mail under contracts and regulations made by the Postmaster-General. They can add no new route and can expedite no service. The postmaster is independent of these superintendents, and they of him. All complaints of service must go

through the department at Washington for remedy. In practice, the Postmaster-General gains information as to the needs or the wrongs of a section of country by sending out one of his force of inspectors under the direction of the chief inspector, who is at Washington, and when that officer has time to report to his chief, and his chief to the Postmaster-General, the question of what to do may be determined. There is no lodgment of original and general power near the people served, and, of course, no responsibility to the people save from the Postmaster-General through the Chief Executive.

The Postmaster-General has the power of appointment and removal of all postmasters, except in the Presidential offices, which number less than one-twentieth of the sixty thousand. He establishes new post-offices when and where he sees fit, and appoints whomever he pleases as their postmasters. For offices of the first, second, and third classes, except in a very few cases where there are government buildings, he leases buildings. In a great majority of towns the post-office is in the centre of business, and a change of the office affects real-estate values, and may retard the prosperity of the town, and occasion the citizens great inconvenience. In these and a thousand other matters throughout the country action is taken without the possibility of a personal examination by the only official having the power to act.

What is demanded, and what must speedily come, is a distribution of the powers and responsibilities of the post-office establishment. A former head of the department, who was distinguished alike for his able administration and for patient and enlightened study of the whole subject of postal affairs, once suggested that there should be a postmaster-general in each State. A properly reorganized system will be one of territorial divisions, and their number and extent may be adjusted by a value standard of the business transacted from year to year; on the heads of these, who should have their offices and reside in their respective districts, should be conferred the powers and laid the responsibilities at present reposed in the Postmaster-General, save such as relate to the more universal interests of the country; and these should be defined in general and reserved in express terms to the central office at Washington.

The Postmaster-General should be permitted to devote his entire time and all his ability to shaping policies, improving

systems, attending Congress with intelligent aid, exercising a general supervision over division chiefs, providing for the transportation of the great through mails, and in negotiating conventions and regulating our large and increasing postal business with other nations.

The other chief reform to which I have referred relates to the laws providing for carrying the mails and to the proper exercise by Congress of its power to establish and control post-roads. It goes without saying that railroad transportation has come to be a necessity in the mail service for which there is no possible substitute. There is absolute dependence upon this method as certainly as if there never had been any other. All relations, commercial or otherwise, are adjusted to modern and rapid methods of communication; yet the important branch of the government to which the administration of postal affairs is committed has no power whatever to serve this need, except by contract. It is clothed with no more authority in the premises than any private individual —*i. e.*, a right to contract if the other party will agree, and even after contract its power extends no farther than to withhold compensation in case of failure to perform by the carrier. It is a startling proposition that the only alternative method provided, in case any great trunk line should refuse to renew its contract for carriage, is that set out in the act of Congress, hereafter quoted, which authorizes the Postmaster-General in such case to send forward the mails "by horse-express, or otherwise"!

Existing legislation, adequate in the days of the stage-coach, the runner, and the road-wagon, when on the failure of a contractor the government itself was equipped and ready to operate its own post-roads, is entirely inadequate to deal with these modern methods; for this the government can command no substitute and no equipment, even were it practicable to move the mails independently over rails in constant use for other business, having no control of facilities, such as the telegraph, signal stations, switches, and like safeguards.

In respect of the absence of authority in the postal administration over railroads, to enforce the carriage of mails and for discipline, our law differs from that of every other civilized nation. It is true that Congress has provided that "all railroads and all parts of railroads which are now and hereafter may be in operation shall be post-roads." This is construed, however, as an

act merely to enable the Postmaster-General to make contracts for carriage on those roads; for, strange to say, about the only function not conferred on that officer in connection with the service was the establishment of post routes. This was reserved to Congress. The highest judicial authority has construed the act just quoted as not conferring authority over the roads, so that it must be taken as a truth, however unpalatable, that the transmission of every mail in the United States, if we doubtfully except the Pacific land-grant roads, is subject to the will or caprice of the carrier, and not to the authority of the government.

In this state of things Section 3999 of the Revised Statutes provides the only remedy, which is as follows:

"If the Postmaster-General is unable to contract for carrying the mail on any railway route at a compensation not exceeding the maximum rates herein provided or for what he may deem reasonable and fair compensation, he may separate the letter mail from the other mail, and contract, either with or without advertising, for carrying such letter mail by horse-express, or otherwise, at the greatest speed that can reasonably be obtained, and for carrying the other mail in wagons, or otherwise, at a slower rate of speed."

The Postmaster-General will have exhausted his resources when he shall have gone to the limit of the power conferred by this act.

But what is far more necessary even than revision and amendment in this regard is the application of governmental authority and summary methods in dealing with railroads under contract. As the law stands, there is no method to compel the keeping of a contract on the part of a railroad company save the power to fine and deduct, which is always limited by the compensation earned. An examination of the penalties provided for delays, and for failures, for neglects, and even for unexcused failures to perform service, will show that they can in no case exceed what may be in the hands of the government, or what may come into its hands from contract earnings of the offender or defaulter. In the present condition of legislation, then, any company now carrying the mails may refuse to continue its contract and may stop the mails on any great trunk line with impunity.

The following is the provision under which fines and deductions can be made in such cases:

"The Postmaster-General may make deductions from the pay of contractors for failures to perform service according to contract, and impose fines upon them for other delinquencies. He may deduct the price of a trip in all cases where the trip is not performed; and not exceeding three times the price if the failure be occasioned by the fault of the contractor or carrier."

It will be observed that while the language might seem to authorize unlimited imposition of fines, yet no provision is made anywhere for the enforcement of the penalty, save from the fund going to the contractor.

In dealing with this branch of the subject it is unnecessary to illustrate the defects in the law by incidents in the experience of the department. It seems to be enough for the purpose to point out the condition of legislation. It is proper, indeed, to state that, with rare exceptions, there has been cordial coöperation on the part of the roads of the country to give good and efficient service; but the department should not, in its dealings, be in a position where it must avoid issues as to its authority, and where, in case of extremity, its only resource—as was the case in one instance in my own administration—is to risk the assertion and exercise of a doubtful power, and an appeal to public sentiment.

It will not do to say, even if it were true, that the conduct of the railroad companies is so good that such legislation is not needed. The position is as indefensible as that of the Anarchist who claims that we need no law. It is the moral force of the existence of law which is effective for the preservation of order, rather than its application and execution.

There is no subject of such vital importance to an efficient postal administration, and, if the defect cannot be cured, there is no graver error in our system. Doubtless the impression is common, and has stood in the way of a remedy, that the needed legislation is beyond the constitutional power of Congress. This impression is erroneous, and on this subject the learning is both copious and authoritative. In favor of the power we find the liberal and the strict constructionist in harmony, and I have been unable to discover any recorded judgment, judicial or political, holding that Congress had not the power here contended for, under the following clause of the Constitution:

"The Congress shall have power to establish post-offices and post-roads; . . . to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer." (Art. I., Sec. 8.)

Mr. Justice Field, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Ex parte* Jackson (96 U. S., pp. 727–732), says:

"The power vested in Congress to establish post-offices and post-roads has been practically construed since the foundation of the government to authorize, not

merely the designation of the routes over which the mails shall be carried, and the offices where letters and other documents shall be received to be distributed or forwarded, but the carriage of the mail and all measures necessary to secure its safe and speedy transit and prompt delivery of its contents. . . . The power possessed by Congress embraces the regulation of the entire postal system of the country."

Mr. Chief-Justice Waite, in the case of the Pensacola Telegraph Company *vs.* West (96 U. S., p. 9), used this language:

"Post-offices and post-roads are established to facilitate the transmission of intelligence. Both commerce and the postal service are placed within the power of Congress, because, being national in their operations, they should be under the protecting care of the National Government. The powers thus granted are not confined to the instrumentalities of commerce or the postal service known or in use when the Constitution was adopted, but they keep pace with the progress of the country and adapt themselves to the new developments of time and circumstances. They extend from the horse with his rider to the stage-coach, from the sailing vessel to the steamboat, from the coach and the steamboat to the railroad, and from the railroad to the telegraph,* as these new agencies are successively brought into use to meet the demands of increasing population and wealth; and they were intended for the government of the business to which they relate at all times and under all circumstances."

The power extends to authorizing what in the judgment of Congress may be necessary measures to secure the object for which the power was conferred. Competition is not permitted because it would tend to cripple the government and take the care of the mails out of its hands. The right to assume exclusive control and direction implies and demands, as necessary incidents, the right to protect the government from rivalry in this business and from being subject to the caprice or extortion of these government carriers enjoying the benefits and protection of the laws. Such a power would be of little avail if it were not coupled with the prerogative to fix the rates which the government would pay for carriage and to require and compel the service of such common carriers as are within the range of the sovereign power of control and regulation.

In the debates in Congress in 1862–'64, which arose upon the passage of the compulsory law of 1864 for ocean carriage, there is not one word of doubt as to the constitutionality of such a measure. Senator Collamer, who was eminent as a lawyer as well as a statesman and an ex-Postmaster-General familiar with the principles on which all postal legislation rests, said: "The committee saw no other way to secure it [the carriage of mails to California] but by providing that, if American ships will not take the mails at the price which the law fixes, . . . they shall have no clear-

* Congress has not yet made telegraph lines post routes, though the power to do so is clear.

ance." Senator Sumner spoke of the measure as one in which Congress ought to act "as a provision to enable the Postmaster-General to carry the mail and as one necessary to meet the emergency of the public service."

Congress, of course, possesses the entire and exclusive power to legislate on this question, and the interpretation has never been doubted that, under the power "to establish post-roads," Congress could, if necessary, invoke the power of eminent domain to lay out and construct necessary roads where none exist. In the words of Judge Story,

"The whole practical course of the government upon this subject from its first organization down to the present time, under every administration, has repudiated the narrow construction of the words above mentioned [*i.e.*, 'to establish post-offices and post-roads']. The power to establish post-offices and post-roads has never been understood to include no more than the power to point out and designate post-offices and post-roads. Resort has been constantly had to the more expanded sense of 'establish,' and no other sense can include the object which the post-office laws have constantly included." (Story on the Constitution, sec. 1136.)

"The clear import of the word [establish] is to create and form and regulate. To establish rules of naturalization is to form and confirm such rules. To establish laws on the subject of bankruptcy is to form, fix, and pass them. To establish the Constitution is to make, fix, and erect it as a permanent form of government. In the same manner, to establish post-offices and post-roads is to frame and pass laws, and erect, form, regulate, and preserve them. Whatever is necessary, whatever is appropriate, to this purpose is within the power." (*Id.* sec. 1131, vol. 2, p. 67.)

It is well settled that the power to fix the prices which common carriers may charge for the transportation of freight or passengers resides in the proper sovereignty. The principle which is applicable is that where private property is affected by the public interest it ceases to be *juris privati* only. Property does not become clothed with a public interest when used in a manner to be of public consequence and affecting the community at large. When one devotes his property to a use in which the public has an interest, he, in effect, grants to the public an interest in that use and must submit to be controlled by the public for the common good to the extent of the interest he has thus created.

As stated by the Supreme Court in the case of Steam Navigation Company *vs.* Merchants' Bank (7 Howard, p. 332),

"The common carrier, in the exercise of a sort of public office, has public duties to perform from which he should not be permitted to exonerate himself without the consent of the parties concerned. He is bound to receive and carry all goods offered for transportation, subject to all the responsibilities incident to his employment."

"They [common carriers] are incorporated as such and given individual powers in order that they may better serve the public in that capacity. They are, therefore, engaged in a public employment affecting the public interest and subject to legisla-

tive control as to their rates of fare and freight." (Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad *vs.* Iowa, 94 U. S., p. 161.)

"Where property has been clothed with a public interest, legislation may fix a limit to that which, in law, shall be reasonable for its use. This limit binds the courts as well as the people, and if it has not been properly fixed, the legislature, not the courts, must be applied to for the change." (Peck *vs.* Railroad, 94 U. S., p. 178.)

When we consider that no new legislation can be had as to the carriage of the mails except by Congress, and that Congress represents the sovereignty having exclusive control over the subject, it follows that, as to railroads or other carriers, it may provide for the certain, speedy, and prompt delivery of that species of freight which is defined to be mail matter, and that the power of restriction as to the rate to be paid for handling and delivery is a necessary incident to the effective exercise of the power.

It has been suggested that, as to some railway corporations created by State legislatures, there is no power to interfere with their rates and charges because their charters are in the nature of contracts under the doctrine of the Dartmouth-College case. A complete answer to this suggestion is that no State by the granting of a franchise can interfere with the powers granted to the Federal Government and not reserved to the States under the Constitution. Every charter must be accepted by a corporation with the implied, if not expressed, condition that it is accepted subject to the laws of the United States relating to those matters over which the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction. As stated in the case of Sinnott *et al. vs.* Davenport (22 Howard, p. 242),

"The appropriate application of that part of the clause which confers the same supremacy on laws and treaties is to such acts of the State legislatures as do not transcend their powers, but, though enacted in the execution of acknowledged State powers, interfere with or are contrary to the laws of Congress, made in pursuance of the Constitution. . . . In every such case the act of Congress or treaty is supreme, and the law of the State, though enacted in the exercise of powers not controverted, must yield to it."

Thus the power of the government to tax corporations has never been called in question. And such rates as are fixed by the State authority are subject to the regulation of inter-State commerce under the constitutional power conferred upon Congress to regulate commerce.

The constitutional grant of power to Congress on this subject is, if anything, in stronger terms than that which confers the prerogative to "regulate commerce," and it furnishes an analogy in

construction. Said Chief-Justice Marshall, in the leading case of Gibbons *vs.* Ogden (9 Wheaton, 103):

"It is the power to regulate ; that is, to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed. This power, like all others vested in the Congress, is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations other than are prescribed in the Constitution."

Following that exposition, in the case of Mobile *vs.* Kimball (102 U. S.), the Supreme Court uses the following emphatic language :

"That power is in the Congress without limitations. It authorizes Congress to prescribe the conditions upon which commerce in all its forms shall be conducted between our citizens and the citizens of other countries, and between citizens of the several States, and to adopt measures to promote its growth and insure its safety."

With the prerogative and duty to legislate clearly apparent, it may still require a few more striking illustrations of the fact that the railroad carrier, and not the Government, is master of the situation, to transform the suggestion for revision, frequently presented to Congress, into an imperative demand from the source of power.

DON M. DICKINSON.

THE TYRANNY OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

BY AUSTIN CORBIN.

IN ANY discussion of the relations between employers and employed, it is a mistake to assume that the former are always wealthy capitalists. There can be little doubt that in the vast majority of cases employers are not men of great wealth, or even of independent means in many cases, whether considered in respect of the aggregate of capital engaged in productive industry or in respect of the number of the employers as a class. While the capital employed by them, great or small, is an important element, their individuality, or, rather, their personal domination and control of their affairs, is the prime factor in the success or failure of their business. In other words, their labor is more important than their capital in the production of successful results. So it is in cases of corporate enterprises; these are owned in a majority of cases by aggregations of holders of comparatively small amounts of capital, who, by putting their savings together, and through the employment of competent managers, are able to conduct active business of great magnitude, more or less profitable, according to circumstances, and employing vast numbers of wo[illegible], skilled and unskilled. Hence the wage question is one in which capital, as such, is only remotely concerned. It is primarily and essentially a questio[illegible] between the employers and the employed.

Until within more recent years the employer was not denied the right to engage for his service those whose skill, energy, and character commended them as the best for his own interest to employ, at such wages, for such work, and such hours of work as should be mutually agreed upon; and the workman was not denied the right to seek and obtain the work and wages to which his skill in his craft and his individual industry and energy en-

titled him. The employer was not denied the right to dismiss an inefficient worker, or any workman when his services were no longer required or desired, except, of course, in cases where specific time-contracts entitled the workman to his wages when, without fault on his part, the work for which he was engaged was not furnished. On the other hand, there never has been a time—and it is fair to assume there never will be—when employers, and public sentiment as well, have not fully conceded to the worker the right to better his condition by leaving his employer's service and obtaining more congenial or suitable employment elsewhere, at his pleasure. The worker in this country at least, under the law, happily, is not a slave; he owes no permanent service to anybody; he is a free man, as he ought to be, and nothing save his own environments, for which no employer can be justly held responsible, can compel his service at any time or place or to any man or set of men. This unbounded liberty of choice of employment and of employers, always left open to the workingman, has been, I might almost say, at the foundation of the progress of this nation. It is true that for generations, in some foreign countries, the tyranny of trades-unions has dominated the lives of a majority of the working people, and only those have been able to escape from it whose indomitable energy, skill, and perseverance have carried them up out of the ranks.

With other good, bad, and indifferent importations of foreign products, we have found ourselves, within recent years, to have acquired a body of professional labor agitators, which has been largely reënforced by lazy imitators of domestic growth. These, both foreign and domestic, find it much more congenial to their idle habits and tastes to assume the rôle of grand knights, grand masters, and walking delegates, with salaries attached and expenses paid, than to earn an honest living by earnest work, as the genuine workman gladly does. The unagitated workman does not pay dues; hence the necessity for agitation, as a means of producing the fund for the payment of these salaries and expenses. Like other phenomenal social and political movements which have had their birth, growth, and decline, this labor agitation assumed the methods of leagues and societies, with forms and ceremonies, oaths and penalties, mysteries and fearful punishments, and, withal, parades and paraphernalia generally. These, and all the like, would be harmless, and are, until they

come within the legitimate domain of the laws of *meum* and *tuum*, upon which our government rests. In lieu of the individual liberty of all workmen which had prevailed in their relations toward their employment, their families, and the state, a new formula was invented and enforced by these self-constituted authorities. Employees then at work were compelled to abandon their duties unless and until the requirements of the league or order were complied with. These demands included rates of wages fixed by the order; hours of labor also arbitrarily fixed; the confinement of help employed to members of the order; an arbitrary uniform scale of wages for all employees engaged in certain forms of work, applicable to all alike, with a limit placed upon the number of young men who should be permitted to learn the trade or craft. These, with an infinite variety of minor regulations, were intended to leave the employer entirely dependent upon the dictation of the managing body of the league or society which his workmen had been induced to join.

It is obvious to all business men, and doubtless also to the majority of intelligent workingmen, that the continuance of this sort of domination of the industries of the country would soon lead to the destruction of the business of all employers and of adequate wages to employees. No one objects to the formation of societies amongst workingmen to promote a better understanding of their craft, the cultivation of better acquaintance with each other and their families, or for the discussion of wages, the prospect of wages, or any other question they feel interested in for themselves or the country in which they live. Business men organize associations for such purposes, and are continually widening their own spheres of observation and usefulness by such conferences; and in the domain of the mechanical arts there are constantly forming new societies for comparison of views and experiences and the promulgation of knowledge concerning the matters of which they know. But these, and such as these, are not dominated by unprincipled demagogues, whose sole purpose is to live by the labor of others; they are unselfish bodies of men who are only too glad to let their light shine, and to teach the new generation what they have learned from their philosophy and experience.

The workingmen of this country, whether belonging to trades and occupations reached by the professional labor agitator or not,

are amongst the best citizens of the nation. They have no other desire than to deal justly in all their relations, whether as employers or employed. They are industrious, intelligent, quick to learn all that is to be learned, and soon become expert in the business they undertake; they are of good habits, and are, beyond question, as a rule, amiable and willing; they furnish the bone and sinew of the Republic, and, through themselves and their children, form the anchor of our hope for the future. There is no country on earth where so many men starting out in life without a dollar, and with nothing to rely upon but their native industry and good sense, have forged ahead to front places, and where the like possibilities are open to all. Multitudes of our most prominent and wealthy people have come from the ranks; all the learned professions and the highest grades of scientific attainment are full of illustrations of the rule. Most of those who have made the greatest impression upon their generation, in their young days wrought with their hands for small pay, and none of them are ashamed of it. It is their just pride that their own industry and energy, and their thorough loyalty to the interests of those who trusted and employed them, have been the foundation upon which their prosperity was built. Not a single one of them all owes his prominence and success to the "labor unions." On the contrary, at least ninety-nine out of every hundred of them, to put it safely, would have failed to reach the positions they occupy, if their young energies had been throttled by the dictation of labor unions, or controlled under the espionage of a "walking delegate."

The recent development in this country of the destructive forms of trades-unionism, which sought practically the subjugation and mastery of all our workingmen and their subjection to the domination of an irresponsible central power, having a staff of paid functionaries under their control, was undoubtedly a serious menace to the peace and comfort of our honest wage-earning people, as well as to the industries of the country. Thousands upon thousands of respectable, honest, sober, and thoroughly competent non-union men were shut out of their legitimate employment by the whim of an idle and vicious class of men, who did not have the courage openly to become criminals, and outrage and defy society, but who chose to employ the machinery of these societies and the less intelligent classes of laboring men (aided not unfre-

quently by accessions from the turbulent criminal class who are ever ready to join in every open outbreak against the public peace) to bring all workers within their influence and under their control. Men who preferred to preserve their personal independence were hooted through the streets of what are termed law-governed and law-abiding communities; denounced as "scabs," pelted with stones, beaten, stamped upon, and sometimes murdered, even in the very portals of justice. Instances have not been rare where the civil authorities were so craven as to desert the hapless independent workingman in the hour of his sorest need; and all this at the behest of Knights (save the mark) of Labor! It has been seen that in this, a country dedicated to personal freedom and independence with the best blood of hundreds of thousands of its citizens, such outrages may be committed in every village; that accounts of them may be openly recorded in multitudes of pages of the daily prints; and yet that the criminal records do not show a single case of adequate punishment. That such outrages have been repeatedly committed, and that the perpetrators, as well as the cowardly instigators, are left unpunished, is a disgrace to the civilization of the nineteenth century.

When it is known—as the writer of this article knows—that a large majority of the membership of these unions is composed of men who are there, not because they want to be, but solely because of their fear of peril to their employment or of suffering personal violence at the instigation of these professional agitators, it would seem to be the duty of employers and of law-makers alike to devise some means whereby those workmen who desire to own their own time, and to be masters of themselves, may be adequately protected in their right to be free from dictation and interference. Some employers have endeavored to accomplish this. They employ no new men who are members of any of the labor unions; applicants are required to promise not to join any while retaining their employment; those who prefer the unions are required to quit the service, and promotions are entirely confined to those of undoubted loyalty to their employer and his policy. The day of terrorism from the unions and their salaried and titled leaders is over in cases where this policy has been rigorously pursued. The walking delegate is not now doing much walking in the neighborhood of works of this class—at least not at the expense of the workmen.

The writer has in mind cases where many thousands of men are employed under such circumstances; and he believes that there do not live an equal number of more honest, manly, industrious, loyal, and capable employees anywhere in any country. But each is, nevertheless, what the labor agitators and their deluded followers call a "scab"—*i. e.*, an independent, manly man, who seeks congenial employment at satisfactory wages, who attends to his work diligently, maintains himself and his family respectably, and is in all things a good, order-loving, and peaceable citizen. It is a title of nobility, indicative of traits of character which they can all afford to live and die by, and to hand down to their children. It is a great satisfaction to know, as the writer does, that the industrious, independent, and law-abiding element among the workingmen is growing fast in this country; and, if the employers of labor will show a tenth part of the independence and willingness to suffer temporary ills that their non-union employees do, there will soon be an end of the matter, and these indolent agitators, who figure only in conventions and newspapers as the friends of the workingman, with salaries attached and expenses paid, will fade out of sight and mind. Any case of real oppression of laboring men by cruel or selfish employers will speedily be detected and remedied by a just public sentiment, without violence to individual liberty or breaches of the public peace.

The natural tendency of these organizations of the destructive class is to keep apart the employer and his employee; whereas their proper relation, growing out of their mutual interests, is one of cordial friendship and respect. Each of them should take an interest in the welfare of the other; and this condition does prevail as a rule where they are both left free from the interference of outside meddlers. But the domination of the agitator could not possibly be maintained without the overthrow and destruction of this sense of mutuality. Therefore, under the teachings of the labor unions, their more ignorant followers are made to believe that their employers are tyrants ready at all times to take every mean advantage of them, and are utterly without sympathy for them or their families. On the other hand, the employer well knows that the union is a constant menace to his business; that his men are unable to consider with him any question of work or wages with any degree of independence, and that the fairest arrangement is liable to be set aside and his business

destroyed at any moment by the arbitrary dictation of some "walking delegate" or "labor chief," acting under the order of some mysterious conclave, holding secret councils over the relations of the employer and his men. No matter how cordial and kindly may be the relations between the men and their employer, or how distasteful and repugnant to the men it may be to leave a service of which they have nothing to complain, suddenly comes an order from some leader whom nobody knows, but whose salary still goes on no matter how long the men remain idle, and in obedience to this mysterious mandate the men are compelled to quit work. Then comes the long, disheartening period of idleness. Those who have been thrifty, and laid aside a little store for a rainy day, see it gradually shrink away in supplying the necessaries of life for the family; others, who have not been so provident, dependent upon the charity of neighbors as poor, perhaps, as themselves, have seen the anxious faces of their wives grow paler daily, the wan cheeks of their children pinched for want of food, and yet, with an abundance of work offering at their doors, they are not permitted to win the bread for which there is such sore need at home. Such scenes have followed and always will follow in the path of the professional labor agitator.

Another tendency of these and similar unions is to dwarf the better classes of workingmen—those who possess skill, enterprise, and the ambition to advance themselves—and to reduce all classes, not merely to the level of the average, but to that of the lower grades, of the indolent and unskilled. No one is permitted to rise on his individual merits; as a consequence, the young workman, full of vigor and hope at first, deprived of the opportunity to attain the rewards which he feels he might reach, soon sinks, a dispirited and broken man, to the lower level of the companionship forced upon him by his order.

I do not believe that the time will ever come when labor-unionism will permanently control the great body of American workmen. If it does, it will produce a state of society wherein the workman will have neither the ambition nor the opportunity to improve his condition or ever to become himself an employer, and where the great mass of bread-winners will be reduced to a state of slavery infinitely worse, in every respect, than that in which the colored race were formerly held in the Southern States. White men, at least, revolt at the idea. They will not submit to

such conditions. Surely there can be no form of slavery more abhorrent to our American people than that in which the head of some labor union is enabled to dictate when a man may, or must not, work for his daily bread; unless it be that more shameful and cowardly slavery of the employer of labor, who, in fear that he may lose something of what he has gained, or that he may fail to add to his gains, will permit a walking delegate, generally an utter stranger to himself and his business, to swagger about his premises and dictate the terms upon which he may be permitted to continue his business. The workingmen of this country should never lose sight of the fact that every labor agitation, even if only spasmodic and temporary, tends to destroy the smaller industries of the country which are scattered all over the land, whereby employment for all kinds of workers, skilled and unskilled, is found throughout nearly the whole of our diversified territory, and to concentrate all productive industries in the larger centres of population, where labor is abundant and cheap, where rents and the means of subsistence are comparatively dear, where squalor and wretchedness prevail, and where filth and disease most abound.

These views are especially commended to the attention of such of our legislators as have been inclined to yield to the spirit of trades-unionism and to limit the operation of the wise laws which were devised by our fathers for the protection of the individual liberty of the humblest workman. Freedom from dictation is the birthright of every citizen. The politician who seeks to take away its safeguards should be reminded that the people have long memories, and that sooner or later their just judgment will be visited upon the unfaithful public servant who, for personal political reasons, by unwise legislation strikes at the independence of the individual wage-worker and at his right as a free man to work at such trades, for such wages, and for such persons as he pleases, without dictation from any quarter.

AUSTIN CORBIN.

OBSTRUCTION IN THE NATIONAL HOUSE.

BY THE HON. THOMAS B. REED, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM MAINE.

IN THE British House of Commons, which has been the model on which all other parliamentary assemblies have been formed, there were, until recently, no rules for the closing of debate, and very few, if any, for coercing members to attend to their duties. All rules were made upon the assumption that each member would do his share of the public business either by voting for a measure or voting effectually or ineffectually against it. He felt upon himself only the burden of his individual action, and, being relieved of that, he was sure he had done all that could be required of him. If a member found that the motion he was to make was manifestly against the sense of the House, he was quite likely promptly to withdraw it; and, as I have been told, members would actually refrain from making speeches when they had a right so to do upon intimation of the House that silence was preferable. This last statement somewhat taxes the credulity of an American, but, of course, it may be so. Foreigners have strange ways. The House of Commons, in a word, proceeded, not by forceful rules, but by common consent, to legislate under the charge of the majority.

A few years ago all this changed. The Irish members began to overturn the custom so long existing, and to avail themselves of the latitude given by the rules to stop legislation and to bar governmental action. The scenes of disorder and confusion which followed have not yet passed from general recollection. Whether the conduct of the Irish members was justifiable and suitable, this is no place to discuss. Nevertheless, it is very certain that no one would undertake to justify their action except on the ground of liberty in danger and of unendurable wrongs which could be righted in no other way. In other words, parliamentary rebellion was justifiable only where the right of revolution existed. The result of such action, however, was the adoption of rules for

closing debate, but rules much less stringent than had prevailed in all similar American assemblies for many years.

In the House of Representatives the rules, like those of the House of Commons, were made upon the very proper hypothesis that every member could be relied upon to do his public duty; that he would vote when the question was up, and would conform to the spirit and intent of the rules, and not violate them both while keeping to the letter. A motion to adjourn, a motion to take a recess, and a motion to adjourn to a future day are all motions absolutely necessary for the transaction of public business. It is supposed that each member who makes such a motion makes it not only because he thinks the House ought so to act, but also because he thinks it probably will so act. Any other course is a violation of that understanding on which all rules must rest. And yet a member may make one of these motions, may, indeed, make all of them, and repeat the series again and again, without himself believing that either ought to be adopted, and without the slightest expection that either will be adopted. In such a case, the member is simply availing himself of the forms of rules intended to facilitate business, for the sole purpose of obstructing business.

Again, whenever bills are presented to the House for reference to appropriate committees, any member can demand that a bill be read. This is an obvious right; for upon the contents depends the reference, and on that members may be called to vote. In making such a request, which is not usual, since in ordinary cases the bill is sure to go to a suitable committee, the member ought to be actuated by a desire to ascertain the contents of the bill in order that he may be prepared to vote intelligently on its reference if called upon. But it has many times happened that the member himself has introduced, for the purpose of demanding their reading, long and tedious bills in which he had no interest—bills already before Congress—in order that, by mere consumption of time by the reading clerk, the legislative day might be wasted on which two-thirds of the House would otherwise have voted to pass a bill which was obnoxious to this single member.

A provision of the Constitution has been wrested from its original design and made the corner-stone of the rampart of obstruction. The Constitution provides that, whenever one-fifth of

the members desire it, the yeas and nays shall be entered on the journal. This calling and recording of the yeas and nays undoubtedly had no other purpose than to give more formality and sanction to the act of voting, and to inform the people how in important junctures of public affairs their representatives had acted. So completely has this provision of the Constitution been turned from its original purpose that I should not be surprised to find that double the number of pages of the House journal had been wasted in the record of yeas and nays on frivolous motions than had been used to record all the votes on serious questions. The flagrant abuse of this provision of the Constitution goes far to justify Roger Sherman's desire to have it stricken out altogether.

Two flagrant cases of misuse of power placed in the hands of individual members occurred in the last Congress, which illustrate both modes of action to which reference has been made.

During the war a direct tax was levied and duly apportioned among the States. Some of the States paid and some refused, and on property in still others the federal authorities partially collected the tax. Obviously either all should pay this tax or none. Either it should be refunded to those States which did pay or be exacted from those which did not. We had an overflowing treasury, the surplus in which used to excite much sympathetic and frightened utterance; but now, singularly enough, the opposition newspapers are thereon mainly silent, although it has somewhat increased. With such an abundance to pay with, the proposition to repay those who had paid, rather than harass those who had not, would seem to have been a wise course. But whether it would or not, it was evidently a case of importance enough to have its day in court and be decided by the ultimate tribunal. Yet a small faction of the Democratic party, by the aid of dilatory motions and the abuse of the Congressional right to have the yeas and nays, after the consumption of the most valuable days of the session, drove in the Northern Democrats and postponed the measure to a session beyond the election, when President Cleveland, not having before him that fear of the people which might have been to him, as to most politicians, the beginning of wisdom, was able to slake his thirst for vetoes on something of greater pecuniary value than a soldier's pension.

The other example of the exercise of power according to the letter and against the spirit of the rules was that of the Union-Pacific Funding Bill. Under the rules of the House, on two Mondays in each month, after the presentation of bills, the rest of the day is set apart to enable the House, after a short debate, to pass bills by a two-thirds' vote, or so to suspend other rules as to enable particular measures to be considered on special days. On the day when the Funding Bill was to come up, a member not content with the fact that the question of considering the bill would be so presented that his one vote against consideration would overbalance any two votes the other way, determined to make himself equal to the whole House. He therefore introduced a bill already before the House—a bill, if I mistake not, to provide for the codification of the laws of the District of Columbia—and demanded the reading of it. Of course, that was sure to finish the day, either by an early adjournment or by exhaustion. Without in any way entering into the merits of the bill, it is enough to say that it was a project to settle with the largest single debtor of the government. The plan of settlement had received the approval of a commission specially appointed by President Cleveland and of a committee appointed by Mr. Carlisle. Whether, after full discussion, the plan of settlement would have stood the test of examination, I do not pretend to say; but it does seem as if, under a republican form of government, two-thirds of the House of Representatives ought not to have been deprived of the power to say whether the subject should be discussed or not.

What is a legislative body for? It is not merely to make laws. It is to decide on all questions of public grievance, to determine between the different views entertained by men of diverse interests, and to reconcile them both with justice. It must in some form hear the people. A negative decision by a legislative body is of as much value to the community as a law. Time is not lost when cases are investigated and action refused. Half the grievances of mankind turn out to be unfounded as soon as somebody is found to listen to them. The law courts decide cases according to law already made, but there is a large class of cases too indefinite for general laws, or which have grown up since general laws were passed, which demand the attention of a body capable of making laws to suit cases. A legislature is the court of very last resort. Therefore it would seem as if it should have such rules of action

as would make the majority efficient. Our government is founded upon the idea of majority rule. There can be no other government by the people.

The citizen, as such, is relieved from government by the majority only in those cases provided for by constitutions. Constitutions are the charters of the rights of minorities, and they have no other. When a legislative body makes rules, it does not make them, as the people make constitutions, to limit power and to provide for rights. They are made to facilitate the orderly and safe transaction of business. Members are representatives, not acting in their own right, but in the right of their constituents. As a body, they represent the whole people of the United States, and have, therefore, no right to limit their own power. Rules should not be barriers : they should be guides.

Men speak of the minority in the House of Representatives as if it were political and always the same—a body fixed and definite, which it were wise to endow with power of its own and for its own advantage. But the minority is a shifting quantity. Not a third of the questions—perhaps not a tithe—are political. Divisions more often run lengthwise of the hall than across it. Hence it is absurd to talk about the rights of the minority as such. The rights they have, and ought to have, are simply those which will serve to guide the whole House acting by its majority to safe and correct conclusions. The right to debate itself, than which nothing ought to be more sacred, is a right conferred, not for the benefit of the individual member, but because by debate alone can all the facts and reasons be brought out which will enable the whole House to make sound and wholesome laws. If time were eternity, or men were angels, there should be no limit to debate. But in the House of Representatives men are not angels, and even time is limited to five hours in the day and six months in the year ; and therefore debate is much abridged. I have been inclined to think it has been too much restricted ; but there seems to be no remedy except in a changed sentiment in the House. When debate becomes the rule and speech-making the exception, we shall have a better state of things in that regard ; for speech-making contributes more than anything else to the ruin of debate.

Among the fears that are sometimes entertained, whenever a proposition is made that wiser rules shall be adopted, is the fear

lest precipitate action, soon to be repented of, will be taken. There was never any fear so groundless as that. The inertia of a legislative body of three hundred men is something enormous anywhere, but is greater, perhaps, in the House of Representatives than anywhere else. There are, and can be, no parliamentary bodies of large membership which can transact business expeditiously. With the greatest liberty new rules could possibly give to it, the House could never pass upon one-fifth of the business presented. With this fear of precipitate action goes the other fear that there would be less debate—less opportunity to present objections and discuss amendments. This fear also is without foundation. Indeed, one of the incentives now to the cutting-off of debate is the fear that it may be used by the unscrupulous in aid and furtherance of delay and dilatory motions. If dilatory motions were reduced to their lowest limit, or, even as such, entirely abolished, there would be greater facilities for action and consideration; and therefore there would be a greater chance for debate, and the danger of unwise laws would be much lessened.

The present system is capable of indefinite abuse, and the actual abuse is increasing every year. For all the period preceding the year 1882, it was always a point of honor not to use dilatory motions in an election case. It being the duty of the House to determine the election of its own members, and its own character being determined by its membership, to prevent a decision upon a contested-election case seemed to undermine the very foundations of parliamentary government. But in 1882, taking advantage of the great confusion into which the death of Garfield and the circumstances which followed had thrown their opponents, the Democrats refused to vote in an election case, and, when a quorum of Republicans was obtained, refused even to let them vote. This illegitimate warfare was carried on to the complete stoppage of all public business, until the House, by a change of its rules, summarily took away the power of using dilatory motions in election cases, and thus put down the parliamentary rebellion. To the credit of the sound sense which the Democratic members had, even when much excited, it should be added that, though they indulged in a somewhat vaporous protest, not one single member of them all will be found recorded against the decision of the Speaker which brought them to terms. This sensible change in the rules was abrogated on the return of the

Democrats to power, and filibustering in an election case has ceased to be rare. If this is to continue, the day is not distant when the House will cease to be what the Constitution says it shall be—"the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members." It has already come to pass that "a majority" is by no means certain to "constitute a quorum to do business."

Nevertheless, all this use of what are called dilatory motions had a reasonable origin and a reasonable cause. It has often been of great value. Sometimes majorities, in what Mr. Jefferson calls "the wantonness of power," have tried to trample down the very safeguards which were intended to preserve them from inconsiderate action. Sometimes majorities have refused the right to debate, on which rests all sound action by deliberative bodies. Sometimes, also, attempts have been made to rush through the House measures of great public importance with no previous notice, without giving the country a chance to be heard in cases where the people's voice, if heard, might be potential. Dilatory motions have often, in such cases, been justifiable and justified. But in those days men used their power to delay with a suitable fear of the consequences. It had to be a good case or the sentiment of a member's own party and the general sentiment of the House soon made it clear to him that he had better abandon a measure so radical. Even a practically unanimous party could not long keep up wanton obstruction. To-day the question is between certain possible benefits and certain assured evils. The sentiment of the House seems no longer able to restrain individuals, and a real public sentiment has not yet been aroused.

The next House will contain no large and successful majority tempted by its largeness and success to ride over the minority. Thus far, the majority seems to be but three, and a majority of three will hardly cover the percentage of loss from sickness and disability. Even if the Territories should add an unbroken band of five, there will then be but three above a quorum; which is hardly enough for business, let alone tyranny.

Undoubtedly, some effort will be made next December to change the rules so that business can be done and the scandals of the last Congress avoided. I ought not to have written the the words "to change the rules," for that conveys an entirely incorrect idea. No rules have to be changed, for the new House will have no rules. What should have been written is that there

will be an effort to establish rules which will facilitate the public business—rules unlike those of the present House, which only delay and frustrate action.

Whether the new rules will simply go back to the days before Mr. Randall was Speaker, or will have changes more or less important than this would be, nobody but the House can say; but the people of the country ought with one voice to help and support any honest effort to do business and to shorten Congressional sessions.

It has been urged as one reason why an extra session should be called in November that the Democrats in the House will struggle against any new rules, even to the extent of reviving and illustrating by another example the scandalous scene of the year 1882, when for days and days they prevented the House from performing its constitutional duty of passing upon the question of the election of a member. I do not believe this to be possible. In 1882 the rules of that House had been adopted, and yet when the House put an end to the Democrats' defiant action by proposing to sustain the Speaker's decision against them, not one of them voted against sustaining the decision, and all were silent as their names were called, when by a unaminous vote of the House an appeal was laid on the table.

The case in December will be much simpler. The House will meet without rules, and must make them. They must be made by the majority of the House, for no one else can by any possibility make them. To suppose that the opposition will refuse to do their legislative duty unless they can dictate the rules is the wildest dream of parliamentary insurrection that ever presented itself to human vision.

But whether they venture on this action or not, the whole subject needs the sunlight of public opinion. If the American people do not get a Congress such as they wish, and legislation such as they need, it is entirely their own fault. I do not mean that they might have elected better men and are therefore to blame. They are at fault if they do not see that the work is done after the men are elected. Public opinion is the ultimate governing power, and if the people were thoroughly in earnest to prevent the waste of time and the injustice of delay involved in bad rules and worse practices, they would find that their servants would no more defy them than they would him who put into their nostrils the breath of life. THOMAS B. REED.

THEATRES, HALLS, AND AUDIENCES.

BY DION BOUCICAULT.

In 1854 Tripler Hall, on Broadway, New York, was burned. It stood on the site now occupied by the Grand Central Hotel. In the same year were built the Metropolitan Theatre and the Lafarge Hotel, covering the same ground. This theatre measured one hundred feet in width by one hundred and fifty in depth. The curtain opening was sixty feet in width—by far the largest in the world. After struggling vainly for five years, the elephantine theatre came to grief. I pointed out to Mr. Lafarge its unwieldy size as the cause of its failure;—no management could successfully deal with such a leviathan. He confided the building to me, and I scooped out the interior down to the foundation, leaving only the walls and roof standing, and within this space a theatre was erected about the size of the Star. We called it the Winter Garden; it was successfully managed until its destruction by fire in (I think) 1866 or thereabouts.

In 1857 the Academy of Music in Philadelphia was built. The object which inspired its proprietors was to have a theatre which should surpass in size any theatrical building in the world. So, on the plans of this monument were traced the outlines of the Scala, the San Carlo, the Covent-Garden Opera-House in London, the Boston Theatre, to show how very much larger was the Philadelphia monster. Amongst the eminent stars that made their appearance there during its opening season came Charles Mathews, the English comedian. He pronounced the Academy a magnificent affair as a theatrical monument, but suggested that every spectator be provided with a telescope and each actor with a speaking-trumpet.

In 1864 the Albert Hall in London was projected, dedicated to the Prince Consort, then recently dead; this hall was to be

devoted to concerts, to fine-art meetings, and exhibitions. The ground was given by the government conditionally on the subscription of a certain amount by shareholders in the building. The payment of $5,000 entitled the subscriber to a private box. I was one of the box-holders that hastened to support the scheme. When the plans were set forth, it was found that the auditorium was to be of proportions so enormous that Langham Church steeple and spire, if set in the midst of the pit, would not reach the proposed ceiling. I ventured to point out that such an auditorium would be found unfit for speech; and even for music it would present all the objections that singers and instrumental performers find in open-air concerts, including, possibly, sundry echoes to distract and confuse the sound. These objections were set at nought; and the Albert Hall was opened by the Prince of Wales in the presence of ten thousand spectators. We cannot call them an audience, as not a word His Royal Highness uttered on this occasion could be heard. The result verified all the objections raised. Then came the remedies. Amongst others, a huge *velarium*, or swinging canvas ceiling, was suspended with lines over the orchestra; but these contrivances failed to mitigate the trouble, for the trouble was and is, simply, that the human voice can fill an area containing only a certain number of cubic feet, and the eye of the spectator can see only within the scope of human vision. These limitations seem to be self-evident, but our ambition and pride continue to ignore, or, at least, to disregard, them.

The most powerful and articulate voice, when used in speech, can fill an enclosed area of 320,000 cubic feet—that is, a room eighty feet in breadth, eighty feet in length, and fifty feet in height; and to fill even this space perfectly the speaker should be aided by certain conditions, which are to be found in the peculiar arrangement of a theatre. Let us assume that the stage and auditorium, taken together, represent an enclosure one hundred and twenty feet in length, eighty feet in breadth, and fifty feet in height. The speaker would stand at a point with eighty feet in front of him and forty feet behind him, this forty feet representing the stage. But this forty feet is contracted, practically, by the hanging scenery above his head, which packs that space closely, excepting twenty-five feet, which is the height left clear on the stage. At the sides scenery on

frames stands in the entrances, packed so closely as to leave about thirty-six feet clear. Thus the speaker finds himself boxed in an area thirty-six feet in width, twenty-five feet in height, and forty feet deep. From this chamber he directs his voice into the auditorium eighty feet in depth, eighty feet in width, and fifty feet in height. The auditorium, packed with an audience and brilliantly lighted, generates considerable heat, while the stage remains at a much lower temperature ; this state of affairs causes a current of air to flow continuously from the stage to the auditorium. It carries the voice of the speaker with it. The draught is very sensibly felt by the spectators at the moment when the curtain is raised, and its presence may be detected by the movement of the curtain, which tends invariably to distend, or "bag," towards the audience, under the pressure of the colder air on the stage, so that in some cases the curtain must be anchored down or held on sliding rings at the sides, that run down on fixed wires or rods ; without which tension the curtain would be blown out over the orchestra.

Here let us pause to agree on some convenient and proper nomenclature to designate the several parts of a theatre. Some years ago I ventured to invent the word *auditorium* to express that portion of a theatre occupied by the audience, and being in front of the foot-lights. I was subjected to some ridicule for this piece of pedantic presumption ; but the word was really wanted, and it stuck. I now propose to call that portion of a theatre occupied by the stage from the curtain backward the *scenarium*. The portion in front of the curtain and between it and the foot-lights is called the *proscenium*. This small space belongs to the scenarium when the curtain is up and to the auditorium when the curtain is down.

With all the advantages enumerated for the conveyance of the voice in theatres, which no other form of auditorium affords, still we have never discovered the principles applicable to the proportions of a great hall by which the voice is spread and conveyed evenly and in the most perfect manner to all parts. After the building is completed, it is, confessedly and notoriously, a matter of accident, and a question to be solved by experiment, whether it is "good for sound." When it proves to be defective, no one can explain why it is so, or where the defect lies, or prescribe a remedy. Echoes will be discovered nestling in one spot;

reverberations confusing the voices will be found in another; a person seated thirty feet from the speaker will hear with difficulty, while his voice reaches one seated seventy feet away distinctly. This hall, containing 300,000 cubic feet, is easily filled by the voice, while in this smaller one, not containing 200,000 feet, the speaker is at great trouble to make himself heard. If acoustics were an exact science, would there be, could there be, any doubt or error in these matters? By experiment we are led to believe that the domed, the arched, the groined roof is bad for sound; and, therefore, in cathedral churches, where it has been found, chanting was used and a musical service became essential: the long, open, sonorous notes which characterize sacred music were, I suspect, an architectural consequence. Those who have listened to a preacher holding forth in a sermon after the anthem may have noticed how unfit such an auditorium is for speech.

Some sixteen or eighteen years ago I visited the great Mormon Temple in Salt Lake City. I have not the precise dimensions of the building, but it certainly contained considerably more than 320,000 cubic feet. Mr. Brigham Young assured me that the voice of a speaker was audible in all parts of this vast area. There is no reason to doubt this statement, and it is mentioned here as a remarkable exception to the general rule. The temple, as well as I can remember, was oval in shape, covered with a flat ceiling coved to meet the walls. From this form I should have expected echoes and over-resonance; but I was informed that there were no such results. The single instance of the Mormon Temple should be received with this reserve: admitting that the voice was audible, what voice was used? The only fair test is by the use of a clear articulate organ, full and resonant, but not forced so as to lose variety of inflection; for we speak on many notes, but in shouting we use only one. So public speakers accustomed to open-air eloquence adopt a monotonous and artificial rant. It is not by such shouting that an auditorium should be tested. In shouting the vowels are excessively used, for we cannot shout a consonant. The consonants give clearness of articulation: earnestness of expression depends on their use. The vowels give sweetness of speech and volume of tone: they are the powder which drive the shot. The secret of being distinctly heard is not loudness of voice, but clearness and crispness of articulation, and that natural, familiar inflection which helps to

convey the meaning of your phrase by its intonation. It is important that the first few words of a speaker be distinctly heard: if they be so, the audience at once lend silence—in itself a potent assistance; whereas if they fail to hear, they will turn aside, and inattention takes many forms of disturbance. The monotone of a Mormon preacher, accustomed to open-air elocution, might with his semi-chant have filled the temple, when a voice limited within its natural compass, and reserving all its uses of inflection, might not be heard.

And here it may be proper to offer the statement that, amongst all the musical instruments, a perfect human voice is the most powerful, surpassing the ear-piercing fife or the brazen trumpet, surpassing in power an orchestra of one hundred and fifty instruments or a chorus of four hundred ordinary voices. Many years ago I attended a monster concert given at the Crystal Palace, London, where the executants numbered, I believe, these figures. Our party, arriving late, were hurrying up the long ascending glass-enclosed corridor that flanks the gardens and conducts to the concert-hall. As we approached, we heard one full and rich note; we stood a moment; it came from the throat of Sophie Cruvelli. As we hurried on, we began to hear faintly some of the brass instruments in the orchestra; nearer still, we began to hear the chorus and the orchestral accompaniment; but soaring out and above all came the clear soprano notes of the singer, easily leading four hundred and fifty contending sounds. The body of sound made by the combination of five hundred sounds does not extend further or fill a greater area than each single sound in the combination. It is like five hundred people throwing stones; the air within a certain region will be full of stones, but not one stone will reach further than its fellows.

When monster concerts were beginning to become popular, Balfe, the composer, and I visited one of them, given I forget where. In the orchestra were upwards of one hundred and fifty executants; of these, of course, two-thirds were strings. Mario came forward and sang. After his pure rich tenor voice rose like a lark in the first bars of the recitative, down came a hundred strings in a thumping chord. It was out of all proportion with the voice. It was an outrage on the ear.

"Balfe," I said, "what do you call that? To me it sounds awful."

"'*C'est magnifique,*'" he replied, "'*mais ce n'est pas la guerre!*' But we are monstrefying everything, as if size and extremity were elements of art. We are tearing the throats of our singers to get one note higher in the compass, to arrive at which we spoil all the rest of his voice. If a fellow can scream a C sharp, he has a fortune, but a D makes a millionaire. Listen to that!"

Mario was singing the tenor solo, from the "Borgia."

"In twenty years hence," continued Balfe, "there will be no such voices heard. Quality will yield to quantity. They will cease to make a Stradivarius. It will all be yell and row-de-dow."

"In an orchestra of those gigantic dimensions, is it easy to hold it all together in perfect unison?"

"You may say, 'Is it possible?'" remarked the musician. "Precision in time and of tune suffers when the orchestra and chorus are too wide for the scope of the conductor. I doubt if perfect execution can be obtained by an orchestra of more than eighty pieces—that is, eighteen on the brass, twelve on the wood, and fifty on the strings, excluding the *batterie de cuisine*. The best execution I ever heard was from an orchestra of these dimensions. But you will see that monstrosity in art will characterize the coming age."

* * * * * *

The exorbitant buildings to be devoted to music and the drama, now either in process of erection or under advisement, in Chicago and in Madison Square and Seventh Avenue, New York, are, by the description we hear of their proposed large capacities, liable to disappoint the hopes of their projectors. Let us parade a few poor and perhaps sordid facts concerning buildings for this purpose, which, after all, must eventually arrive at the fundamental question—will they be self-supporting? will they pay?

I have frequently heard the management of a theatre complain that it was too large. I have never heard a manager complain that his house was too small.

A large theatre requires for the production of the same work a greater number of musicians in the orchestra; a greater consumption of gas; a greater number of attendants; a larger number of supernumeraries and ballet; a larger staff of carpenters, property-men, and gas-men; a larger amount of canvas and wood for the larger scenery; a larger quantity of furniture on the stage.

There is an increment in every department. It is, therefore, much more costly to carry on than a smaller theatre. The same entertainment does not look so well on the large stage, unless it be a spectacular play, and the public do not patronize a performancein proportion to the size of the theatre in which it is given.

The popular places of public entertainment have always been medium-sized or small.

* * * * * *

The stature of the actor should determine the size of the stage on which he appears, and the distance at which his features can be perfectly seen may determine the proportions of the auditorium. The measure of the spectator's eye may be taken as a standard for his ear, for within that scope the actor will be heard: the two senses are, so far as a theatre is concerned, of equal capacity.

I now approach another matter, which many may say is not a matter of fact; and I am diffident in making the statement because it seems to conflict with a principle laid down by Huxley, who says: "It is wrong for a man to say he is certain of the truth of any proposition unless he can produce evidence which logically justifies that certainty." Yet I am certain that some artists possess a power over a multitude which cannot be logically accounted for; that I have again and again witnessed a phenomenon, and have myself exercised a power, of which I am sensible, but of which I can render no explanation. When a public speaker or an actor approaches his public, his mind reaches forth to collect them; his art is to deprive them of their separate individualities, and fuse all listening minds into one—to make all hearts beat as one; and, as he leads them to beat, to bring them irresistibly into one current of sympathy. Those who have dealt with masses of minds under such conditions will remember the indecision and fluctuation that precede the moment when, not gradually, but suddenly, the crowd becomes unified by a kind of electric shock. The actor, feeling the effect, murmurs to himself the old stage expression, "I have got them!" He feels the instant, not by any sound emitted or any indication audible or visible; but by some sympathetic chord, which becomes taut and vibrates. I, sitting as a spectator, perhaps as author of the play, and watching for this well-known and expected phenomenon, feel the shock and know its meaning. Passing, as my vagabond life has led me, from

London to New York, over the United States, to Australia, visiting a hundred different cities and practising on many different audiences, I have been able to compare results, and find that, when an audience exceeds a certain size, it is very difficult to establish in it perfectly this fusion of minds. I may succeed with the lower regions and fail to bring the upper into the swim. I feel there is a limit where my efforts prove unable to keep the whole a unit. I might ascribe this failure to my own deficiency of power, but I have remarked the same failure under similar circumstances, when great artists were using their grandest efforts.

Wherefore I am led to believe that a group of more than two thousand persons is not so susceptible to the psychic influences exerted by artists as a group of less than that number. There is a limit to the genius of the actor as regards its reach over his audience; and no auditorium should exceed in size that limit.

If one were not afraid of overloading your readers with theatrical phenomena for which we fail to account, I would ask how, in a city of over two millions of inhabitants like New York, or of five millions like London, when a popular play is running, does the public so measure the capacity of a theatre that, if it holds fifteen hundred people, that number exactly, or within a hundred or so, present themselves nightly for admission; but if it be the Madison-Square Garden, with Barnum's exhibition, holding ten thousand, that number will present themselves? The same holds good in London and in Paris.

DION BOUCICAULT.

A STORM-CENTRE IN THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D.

THE American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions is a close corporation which was organized in the year 1810 for the immediate purpose of sending certain young men as missionaries to the heathen. Its administration is entrusted to several general secretaries, who act under the advice of a Prudential Committee. Practically, though not formally, the secretaries have chosen fit persons to serve on the Prudential Committee, the committee, with the secretaries, have nominated proper members of the corporation, and the corporate members have periodically reëlected the secretaries and committee. For years nothing happened to disturb this safe and amicable understanding. And the board, under this method of management, has achieved an honorable record of missionary success.

Recently, however, the American Board has become a storm-centre of theological controversy ; and besides the special interest which naturally accompanies the reports of a great missionary enterprise, its next annual meeting, which is to be held in New York in October, will attract the attention generally of observers of the conditions and progress of religious thought in this country. It is necessary to review the course of events which have invested a foreign missionary society with this unusual interest, in order that the recent controversy in the American Board may be made intelligible to the general reader, and that the principles and position of the so-called liberal or progressive body of men among its Congregational constituency may be fairly understood.

During the earlier years of its history many theological storms swept over New England, but the American Board was happily kept clear from them all. Its original intention, to which during the best years of its history it has been held steadfast, cannot

be better described than in these words, which one of its former secretaries used in explaining the constitution of the board: "How entirely aloof has it stood from party, belonging to none, claimed by none, employed by none! It makes no appeal to sectarian or party feelings." In 1871 the board distinctly declared that it was not to be regarded as a theological court. But at the annual meeting which was held in Portland in 1882 the clear missionary voice of the board seemed to be disturbed by an undertone of theological anxiety. Its best friends, however, hoped that this was but a discordant echo which had been borne into its proper discussions from outside, and they would not believe that any serious intention could be cherished of using a foreign missionary society for purposes of domestic theological correction. None were more astonished than the liberal men within the denomination from which the board mainly derives its support when, a few years later, they learned that the Prudential Committee had begun to use their authority for purposes of theological discrimination. The liberal leaders, apprehending the disaster which might befall the board, should it allow itself to be dragged into a pending theological discussion, succeeded in keeping from the newspapers for several months the complaints which had come to their knowledge of the rejection, for supposed theological reasons, of an estimable lady teacher by the officers of the board. Further cases of proscription, however, followed, and when all other private means of preventing what seemed to be the outbreak of a needless controversy had failed, it is a matter of unwritten history that as a last resort, at the solicitation of liberal men, the venerable Dr. Mark Hopkins, then president of the American Board, visited Boston and threw the whole weight of his influence on the side of conciliation and practical Christian comprehension. His effort proved of no avail; the Prudential Committee persisted in the policy of theological proscription which they had conscientiously adopted, and the open and memorable debate at Des Moines became the inevitable consequence.

The position which President Hopkins took upon that day has been ever since the main position of the liberal minority in the board. He maintained that "the Prudential Committee is not a theological committee," and that the board should not be used "as a make-weight in a theological controversy." The liberals declined then, as they have always refused, to advocate on

the platform of the board the particular doctrinal opinions which they are supposed to hold; but they pleaded for a policy of non-interference, and of practical comprehension to be restricted only by the limits of fellowship within the constituency of the board.

The controversy thus begun became intensified during the following year, attracting wide notice on account of what was known as the case of Mr. Hume. That able and successful missionary of the board had been arraigned by the Prudential Committee for some remarks which he had made in an after-dinner speech at Andover; the place where he was bold enough to speak, as well as the few words which he uttered, having much to do with the offence which was taken in the rooms of the board. The whole history of the trials and tribulations through which that devoted Christian man was at length suffered to go on his way by his brethren has never been written: those personally conversant with the facts might relate how he was called upon to make statement after statement of his theological position; how, when the committee seemed unable to understand his repeated explanations of his views and he had asked for an ecclesiastical council to inquire into his orthodoxy, that request was ignored, while still further examinations, oral and written, were instituted by different officers of the board; and how at last, under a rising storm of public indignation, this Christian man was grudgingly permitted to carry the water of life to the heathen;—all this tribulation, to those familiar with the whole trial of Mr. Hume, forming one of the most surprising instances of the survival of mediævalism in the nineteenth century. I do not imagine that it would have taken the Apostle Paul five minutes to decide whether a man like Mr. Hume should be suffered to preach the Gospel among the Gentiles; and even the conservative St. James would have required of him no further promise than Mr. Hume's whole career showed that he was peculiarly fitted to give,—no greater burden than such things as may seem necessary for peace. To the general student of religious history this treatment of Mr. Hume in the rooms of the Prudential Committee furnishes interesting material for the better understanding of the psychology of the Inquisition.

The controversy in the American Board, thus inaugurated and intensified, reached a climax at its meeting in 1887 in Springfield. In the action which was then taken by the board there was no

ambiguity. The progressives have since accepted it as a distinct announcement and authorization of the policy of proscription and exclusion which had been asserted by the Home Secretary. Men representing almost every important educational interest in New England, men who had long been recognized as sound and able leaders of their denomination, men, too, who spoke for churches that make the largest contributions to the treasury of the board, urged the opposite policy of comprehension, and protested against the assumption of theological authority by the Prudential Committee; but they were outvoted, and their plea for toleration signally failed. The Rev. Dr. Storrs, who had been placed in a somewhat embarrassing position by the partisanship which had taken cover under his wide reputation, after much hesitancy accepted the presidency of the board to which he had been elected by the majority, and wrote a letter of acceptance which was doubtless intended to be conciliatory. The liberals did not desire to embarrass any effort at conciliation which Dr. Storrs might make, and accordingly they have waited to see what fruit, if any, his influence might bear, although they have not been blind to the fact that Dr. Storrs's letter, at best, offered only an attempt to find a point of ecclesiastical equilibrium somewhere midway upon a sliding theological scale, and was not an effort to settle a disturbing question upon some fixed and permanent principle. But wishing to allow ample time for the majority to effect any possible alleviation of the situation, the progressives generally absented themselves from the next annual meeting at Cleveland, and made no motion to confuse the responsibility for the policy of the board which rested upon the majority. With the exception of the inauguration of a movement looking towards a future reorganization of the board on a more representative basis, nothing, however, of importance was attempted by the party of the majority at Cleveland.

One other and an important fact belongs to this chapter of ecclesiastical history. Subsequently to the last meeting of the board the Berkeley Temple, a Congregational church in Boston, by the advice of a council, took action to send, independently of the board if necessary, one of its members, to whom a missionary commission had already been refused by the Prudential Committee. Having been a second time rejected by that committee, he has been sent by his church to Japan, where he is now working in cordial coöperation with the missionaries of the board.

Such in brief has been the course of the recent controversy in the American Board.

If in this rapid review of it I have not yet mentioned the theological question which has been made prominent in the discussion, it is because from the first it has seemed to me to be the accidental point of collision between different tempers of mind and tendencies of thought, and not the real and essential principle at issue, so far, at least, as pertains to the conduct of a missionary society. Storm-centres of theological discussion are constantly shifting; providentially the area of low pressure does not always remain over the same region of thought. Had a minute examination, like that to which candidates have been subjected by the secretaries touching their hope for the future life, been instituted with regard to their views on the nature of the sources and documents contained in our sacred Scriptures, the point of theological stress and difficulty might have been changed. But whatever may be now or another day the particular doctrine which the progress of thought may summon for reëxamination in the minds of men, the contention of the liberals is that the practical work of the church should not be made to rise or fall with the theological barometer, but should be kept broadly and generously true to the main Christian purpose and life of the churches.

At its meeting in October the board will have before it some results, already becoming evident, of the policy of exclusion which has now been in practical operation for three years.

It appears that the conciliatory letter of Dr. Storrs has had little appreciable effect in changing the conduct of the Prudential Committee. The door does not yet seem to stand much farther ajar, or to swing open more easily to missionary candidates who are suspected of adding too much knowledge of German or recent English theology to their graces of piety. At least, some recent correspondence with reference to the possible appointment of such persons has not proved sufficiently encouraging to warrant its continuance. Practically three theological seminaries, supported by the Congregationalists, are shut out from participation in its board of foreign missions. Individuals from these seminaries may slip in, but, as a class, those who are educated in them, who receive their best spirit, must look elsewhere than to the American Board for terms of honorable Christian service. Young men

who may venture to admit into their thinking any larger hope for multitudes of men than consistent Calvinism or "the faith once delivered to the saints" of the seventeenth century can allow, may find plainly written for their warning over the door to the Home Secretary's office the words which Dante saw when he approached the gate of the Inferno—"Abandon hope, all ye who enter here." The secretaries, indeed, continue to invite these young men to come; but they are naturally reluctant to accept the bonds held up for them to put upon their reasons, and from which, as pastors of our churches, they would find themselves free. The present theological committee of the board have sought to meet this emergency, which their policy has created, by looking for more docile, not to say more learned, men in Canada!

Another natural result of this policy of proscription which is already becoming obvious to those in a position to observe it, and which will become more painfully evident the longer the present policy is persisted in, is the deterioration of the missionary service. The strongest, most independent young men cannot for a period of years be turned aside without serious loss to the future efficiency of our missions. President Hopkins, with a flash of sagacious wit, once remarked that there was danger that the American Board would become "an old men's society." If that prophecy is not to hasten to disastrous fulfilment, obviously the board must be administered by officers in touch with the life now stirring among men, and who can understand, without numberless examinations, what is going on in the minds of young men.

The gradual effect upon the finances of the board of a persistent policy of exclusion presents another problem which may profitably receive consideration at its next meeting. The financial honor of the American Board has never been impeached. Not a dollar contributed to it has been lost by those to whom its funds have been intrusted. They justly deserve the continued confidence of the churches. Nevertheless, its present financial condition is a matter for serious consideration. Had it not been for a liberal use of two large legacies, one of which is supposed to be used for the development of new missions, and the other of which, by vote of the board, was "set apart to meet special calls," an unfortunate gap would ere this have become apparent between the ordinary receipts and the needed appropriations of the board. The published reports of the treasurer do not disclose the exact

extent of this difference between the annual receipts and the amounts required to keep missions up to existing standards of efficiency. Only an itemized account of the alleged "special calls" for which large drafts have been made during the past five years upon these legacies, can reveal the exact financial condition of the board. I doubt if the Home Secretary would admit in the exegesis of his favorite Biblical texts the liberal principles of linguistic interpretation which are suggested by an attempt to discover for what "special calls" so large a draft as $154,000 was made in one year upon the Swett legacy of the board. We would not be misunderstood as questioning the judiciousness of that expenditure; doubtless the exigencies of the service called for it; but we would suggest that, in order that the exact financial condition and prospects of the board may be fully disclosed, an itemized account of these drafts for the past few years should be forthcoming.

Thus far the progressives have loyally continued their contributions for the support of existing missions; but the responsibility for the effect upon the finances of the board of a policy of exclusion rests upon the majority. While the theological party now administering the American Board are occupied in the somewhat unfortunate attempt to exclude from it those whom they regard as heretics, they should not suffer the board to slip blindly too near the edge of a financial precipice. We, on our part, do not disguise our fear that a prolonged policy of proscription and division will naturally result in financial, as well as moral and intellectual, loss to the board and its missions.

The effect of this division policy upon the efficiency of our missionaries in the field is another result of it already coming within the range of prediction. Were the action which was taken at Springfield consistently pressed, it would involve the recall of some of our ablest missionaries. It would mean also the offer to the heathen of the theology of a portion of the board, or the dogma of a secretary of the board, as the condition of Christian communion. "Japan," said an intelligent Japanese student, "does not want your New England theology; it does need your American Christianity." The problem still before the American Board might be reduced to that simple statement of it: what will you decree to send to India or Japan—a stone from your dogmatic quarry or the bread of life? a provincial theology or a catholic Christianity?

The remonstrants, or protestants, within the American Board are not a party bound by any special theological covenant. The particular doctrinal point which in recent discussions has been much debated is the hope entertained by some among them that somewhere, and somehow, there shall be found one gracious opportunity, there shall be afforded by the God who is no respecter of persons one Christian probation, for all men. It does not seem to those who harbor this hope to be a very revolutionary, or unreasonable, or unscriptural view ; but by none of them is it put in the first line of the simple and grand Christian affirmations. It belongs, with all similar answers to moral difficulties in Christian doctrine, to the second or third line of the inferences which may be suggested by the Scriptures, or the hopes love may conceive of amid the troubled visions of faith. The progressives, as for want of a common name they may for convenience be designated, are by no means agreed in their theological thinking. They dwell in the same ancestral home in the unity of the Spirit ; but they throw open different windows of outlook towards the far horizons of God's purpose. They are agreed in their reverence and love for their common Christian hearth, and also they act together in opposing the locking any doors by which knowledge from far or near may enter, or the darkening of any windows through which speculative thought may gain vision of realities beyond knowledge. They are not contending within the American Board for any private opinion which may be entertained among them ; but they would keep room in their churches for a fearless faith, and in the work of their denomination they would pursue a policy of enlightened charity. They deem it far wiser and safer to trust young men with Christianity, and to trust Christianity to such young men as have been refused commissions by the board, than to put them in bonds to the somewhat modern theological traditions which the Home Secretary has commended to the faithful in his recent revised and emended edition of the Apostles' Creed.

From the outset, the protestants in the American Board have refused to be driven into a schismatic position. Theirs, too, are the fathers, and they mean, so far as lieth in them, to live peaceably with their brethren. Thus far they have had little difficulty in doing so outside the American Board. Ecclesiastical councils, east and west, with unbroken unanimity, have declared for toleration and practical comprehension within the denomination.

Only within the close corporation of the American Board has schism been invited. Into that sin of schism the liberals do not propose to be driven. They are bound by their whole spirit not to be schismatic; they are also compelled by the positive force of their faiths not to rest content with a merely negative position in any evangelical or Christian work. The key to their solution of their double obligation of fidelity to the American Board and of faithfulness also to the cause of missions, is found in the action, already narrated, by which, with the advice of a Congregational council, an independent missionary has been sent by a particular church to coöperate with missionaries appointed by the board. Whether other churches may have occasion to send still other men in a similar independent but friendly way will depend largely upon what the majority at the next meeting of the board may judge to be their responsibility for the still unrepealed, and as yet officially unmodified, policy of proscription adopted at Springfield.

It is not for us to foresee whether the conservative reaction from that extreme position, many signs of which have appeared, will make itself sufficiently felt to effect any practical alleviation of the situation at the October meeting. We do not venture to predict whether any benign influence may then arrest a course of administration whose deteriorating and disintegrating effects upon a great cause are already too plainly evident. It is not easy always to open the eyes even of good men that they may see what is going on around them. But so long as the action which was taken at Springfield remains unmodified or unrepealed, unofficial or private mollifications of it, though well meant, do not clearly relieve the situation. If any helpful action is taken by the board in New York, it is to be hoped that it may be explicit. Whether at that time the minority may choose to wait still longer in quietness, or to renew their protest and their plea for toleration, time and circumstances will determine. But whatever may be done, or left undone, at the coming meeting in New York, the protestant minority, the party of comprehension, within the American Board may confidently wait and work, deprecating indeed the temporary loss to Christian missions which results from a policy of proscription, but believing that in time Christian charity and common-sense will settle generously and happily this whole needless and wasteful controversy.

NEWMAN SMYTH.

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF THE CIVIL WAR.

V.

BY GENERAL VISCOUNT WOLSELEY, K.P., ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF THE BRITISH ARMY.

In my last article I dealt with the operations in the East, which are described in the third volume of *The Century's* papers on the Civil War. With a few further remarks on that subject, I shall pass on to consider the story of the campaigns in the West, which are also placed before the public in that volume.

The silence which was necessarily imposed upon General Burnside by loyalty to the Federal authorities has been, fortunately for us, broken through by Major Mason's highly irregular, but very interesting, personal invasion of General Burnside's headquarters. Very dramatic, certainly, is the scene described (page 101) where the Federal commander, after his terrible defeat, sitting "on an old log and being provided with crackers, cheese, sardines, and a bottle of brandy (all luxuries to a Confederate), discussed this lunch, as well as the situation," with the Confederate officer who had surreptitiously secured the interview with him.

It is very characteristic of that kind of West Point comradeship which was never wholly lost among the men who, on the two sides, were doing their best to kill one another, that Burnside should have been anxious to let the able soldiers opposed to him know, what he could not tell his own army, "that he was not responsible for the attack on Fredericksburg in the manner in which it was made, as he was himself under orders and was not much more than a figure-head."

Who, then, was responsible for this and for similiar incidents? There exist in all professions certain men who make their way in the world by pandering to popular prejudices. In the army and the navy the form which this particular quality takes is one which is common in all countries, but in England and America it has

a special character of its own. During peace, the business of these men is to find excellent military reasons for the penny-wise economies which suit the taste of ministers who want to present a favorable budget to their countrymen. During war, their business is to clothe in military phraseology, and perhaps in army orders, the current popular prejudices of the time. Now, there is no wish to judge here of General Halleck's private character, or to say that, as a public servant, he may not have possessed many high qualities. But, taking the history of these campaigns from the time when he was appointed to the general command of the armies of the United States till the moment when, on "the coming of Grant," he was reduced to the position of a highly useful subordinate, I cannot trace the least evidence of his having ever given a decision which represented more than the embodied prejudices of the moment. There was a popular feeling that the mighty Army of the Potomac ought to brush from its path and easily destroy its numerically-inferior opponent; therefore the one thing said to be wanted was that it should go straight at its enemy and attack that enemy wherever found. Hence the orders from Washington for the disastrous attack on Fredericksburg, and hence the fatal persistence in that attack after all chance of surprising Lee, or of taking him at a disadvantage, had utterly disappeared.

When Lee began to move to his left after Chancellorsville, he offered General Hooker an obvious opportunity to overwhelm his right, which was still at Fredericksburg, and to threaten Richmond, long before any possible danger could have arisen to Washington with its powerful defences. But Lee was able to count with confidence upon the fears of a capital city and of the government within it for their own safety. The event proved that he was right. The mere suggestion by Hooker that to attack Lee's right was the proper course to pursue was sufficient to cause the removal of that general from his command. After Gettysburg, the popular impression appears to have been that the Confederate Army had been routed and that the Federal Army was virtually intact. The true state of the case was that the Confederate Army had certainly suffered very severely. It had been repulsed and defeated, but it was in no sense disorganized, and the Federal Army was in no condition for an effective general advance.

According to the evidence supplied by this volume, General Meade, at Gettysburg, appears to have done all that any one but a man of quite transcendent military genius could have done to organize an effective pursuit. Few soldiers can, therefore, read without some angry feeling the letter which Halleck then sent to Meade.

'I need hardly say to you that the escape of Lee's army without another battle has created great dissatisfaction in the mind of the President, and it will require an active and energetic pursuit on your part to remove the impression that it has not been sufficiently active heretofore."

That feeling must necessarily be increased by his further missive in answer to Meade's natural and immediate reply, asking to be relieved from the command of the army. "My telegram stating the disappointment of the President at the escape of Lee's army was not intended as a censure, but as a stimulus to an active pursuit." Clearly General Halleck was in his wrong place. If, after Meade had won for the Federals the first great victory of the war over Lee's army, it was advisable then and there to remove him, the first letter would have been a fitting preparatory step to that end. Otherwise, to say that it was not a censure, and yet send it, was an act of feebleness, and displayed great ignorance of how a general commanding an army in the field should be dealt with. What pursuit had Halleck carried out after Shiloh? Of all men in the war, Halleck was the last who ought to have reproached another man for not adequately reaping the fruits of victory. Jackson's principle is always sound—never to "let up in pursuit" while pursuit is possible. But pursuit must have been begun in order to be followed up. An attack on the Confederates on the 4th July, if it had been possible for the Federal Army, would probably have been disastrous to the Confederates, because of their want of ammunition. No one who was not then present in the Federal Army can judge if it was possible. No one who was present at Gettysburg seems to have considered that it could be made. Under those circumstances, Halleck's business, as the chief military adviser of the government, was clearly to have pointed out to the President, " It is impossible to judge without being on the spot whether it would have been possible to do more than Meade has done ; but as long as we retain him in command we must give him every sign of our confidence and all encouragement." It would have been easy so to word an earnest belief in his future success as to suggest an eager pursuit.

It is not proposed to enter closely into what is called the "Meade-Sickles controversy." There are evidently exaggerations on both sides. General Meade, having only just succeeded to the command of the army before the battle of Gettysburg, was in a very difficult position. He seems to have used considerable judgment in the mode in which he brought up his reserves to the right place and at the right time. If he was unjust, as he is charged with being, in his report of the share of the different corps in the action, he only failed in what is an almost impossible task. No general can know for long after a battle all the details of what has happened in it. On the other hand, "councils of war" are recorded under Meade and other generals in this war as though they were the most natural and legitimate things in the world. It is difficult to conceive the circumstances under which such councils as are here described, and by means of which the general in command would seem to endeavor to transfer his own responsibility to the shoulders of the majority of the council's members, can be other than a blunder and a sign of weakness. Newspaper reports of wars have, I think, often tended to create very unfortunate popular impressions as to the frequency of these councils in all campaigns, which may even affect soldiers. Whenever a number of generals are known to be assembled at headquarters, those in search of news naturally jump to the conclusion that some event is about to take place, and announce to their readers that a "council of war" is being held. Nine times out of ten the generals have only been assembled to give such information as they possess, to state their views, and to receive their orders. The character of such a proceeding is altogether changed when it is announced as a deliberative "council of war"—the abomination of all strong men, a byword for inefficiency and want of decision, and for weakness of action in all military matters. The decision of Meade's "council of war" on the second day at Gettysburg, like that arrived at by most councils of war, was not to attack, and, therefore, as it fortunately proved, to remain where they were and accept battle. This decision cannot be taken as a model for future imitation, though it happened in this instance to be the right course, as it turned out.

On one point more there is a word to be said before we pass from the East to the West. The evidence appears to be clear that on the

afternoon of the first day of Gettysburg, at 4 o'clock, General Ewell had his corps, 20,000 strong, ready in column of attack to assault Culp's Hill. (Page 411.) The evidence is equally clear that, in all human probability, if that attack had then been delivered, it would have been successful, and that, if successful, the whole of Cemetery Ridge would have become untenable. Further, it is clear that Lee stopped that attack against Ewell's judgment. As the case arose, and as the facts were, there can be no question that this was an unfortunate decision. Lee was aware of the advance of Slocum's corps to the support of the Federals, and knew that his own army was not yet concentrated, but that, in all probability, it would be concentrated more effectively than the Federals could be by the following morning. This was the evidence before him at the time, and the reasoning to be inferred from it, under all the circumstances of the case, leads one to think that he was justified in postponing the attack as he did. If Lee had then known what we now know, it may be assumed that he would have attacked; but had we been in his position then, it is tolerably certain that most generals would have done as he did. It is not by the knowledge we now have of all the circumstances that such a decision as that of Lee must be judged, but by the knowledge of the facts which he himself then possessed. That this knowledge was not more accurate was, no doubt, due to the previous absence of Stuart and his cavalry. It was the only campaign of the war in which Lee fought blindfold, and he bitterly paid the penalty for so fighting. It would be rather interesting to know whether disappointment at losing the precious opportunity did or did not, during the following days, somewhat affect the vigor of Ewell's coöperation. Something of the usual energy of the Confederates seems to have been missing on that side, and though it may be attributed chiefly to the delay and the uncertainty of the hour of Longstreet's attack, other causes probably contributed, and this disappointment on Ewell's part was most likely among them.

There seems to be this general peculiarity about these campaigns in the West—that they were fought very much to secure recruiting districts. Where the condition of feeling was such that it made all the difference whether the district was in the occupation of the Federal or the Confederate troops, and whether the

State authorities were in sympathy with Washington or Richmond, it is obvious that the conditions are very unlike those which usually obtain in European warfare. The only very analogous wars to which one can go back for similar conditions in this respect are those of Wallenstein and Gustavus Adolphus. Gustavus, when he died, left to his successor several armies, though he had entered Germany with but one. It made all the difference that he had been able to clear the Protestant districts of the Imperial troops, and to establish recruiting depots there. It is obvious that the wisdom of military movements, and the relative importance of certain campaigns, cannot, under these circumstances, be judged on precisely the same principles on which one would judge contests between the different nations in Europe.

If the statements as to the condition of popular sentiment in California and in the West during the earlier years of the war, which are furnished us in some of these papers, are to be relied upon, it is evident that the so-called New Mexican campaign was a much more important matter, small as were the forces engaged in it, than it has been supposed to be. As General Grant has said, the Confederacy, without large territories to extend into, was doomed, even if it succeeded in establishing its independence. It looks as if, but for the judicious arrangements made by the Federal commander, the Confederate forces, after their successes at San Augustine Springs and Valverde, might have formed an imposing army in New Mexico and Texas. Such an army, if properly supported from Richmond, might have enabled the various Confederate sympathizers to make head in California, and to secure the all-important Pacific Coast, with its important gold supply. It is scarcely possible to overrate the difference which that would have made in the conditions of the war. Probably the Confederacy, cut off as it was from all the outside world by the original mistakes of Mr. Davis's administration, could not have afforded to furnish supplies for this New Mexico campaign. But considering the initial success which attended it, and that it failed almost entirely from lack of material resources, one is led to think it would have been worth a more serious effort.

The junction of Van Dorn and Price with General Beauregard's forces, after the battle of Shiloh and the retreat from Corinth, seems to show clearly how easy would have been that junction in the mode suggested in my first article, prior to the

Pea Ridge campaign and the battle of Shiloh. Then it would, in all probability, have been decisive as far as the battle of Shiloh itself was concerned, and at least for the year it would have left the whole West in the hands of the Confederacy. Considering the state of feeling prevailing at that time, it is impossible to gauge what might not have been the effect in the creation of new Southern forces. The retreat from Corinth seems to have been an extremely skilfully-contrived movement on the part of General Beauregard. General Halleck appears to have done about as little as it was possible for a man to do with the imposing forces and the able soldiers, Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan, who were with him. The regathering of the Confederate forces at Tupelo, and the scattering of the great Union Army, are among the most curious incidents of the war. General Beauregard had done great things for the army under his command during the halt at Corinth and Tupelo. Under his fostering care it had vastly improved both in discipline and in military training. It was a Confederate misfortune when ill-health obliged him to leave and hand over command to General Bragg. The whole of Bragg's ill-advised invasion of Kentucky and the simultaneous movements which led to the battles of Iuka and Corinth, in September and October, 1862, can, it seems, be only justly judged by taking into account the question of the recruiting districts. Bragg's advance into Kentucky was a mere flash in the pan, not because of any strategical or tactical considerations, in the ordinary sense of the term, but because Kentucky did not rise in support of the Confederate cause. Whatever may have been the reason,—whether the actual amount of anti-Union feeling in the State had been exaggerated, or because, as Bragg thought, the blue-grass region was too rich to allow men readily to sacrifice their wealth and ease for any cause,—the fact remains that Bragg's invasion was undertaken to gain recruiting districts; that is, in other words, to afford the people of Kentucky the chance of rising in support of Southern independence. The attempt was a failure; the people did not enlist even in sufficient numbers to make up the waste which the campaign itself entailed. It is, therefore, difficult to see how any change in the handling of troops could have made much difference in the final result. "The people have too many fat cattle and are too well off to fight," was General Bragg's commentary upon the conduct of the Kentuckians.

Van Dorn's movement on Corinth to make a direct attack upon it, instead of manœuvring Rosecrans out of it, was a mistake that seems obvious on the face of the facts. When Bragg had been intrusted with the chief command in the district, it was an enormous blunder on the part of the Confederate Government to place Price's forces under the command of Van Dorn. This arrangement, made without notice, suddenly deprived Bragg of the support upon which he had counted; that is clear enough. It distinctly violated the principle so well expressed afterwards by President Lincoln, that it is not wise "to swap horses whilst you are crossing a stream." As far as one can now judge of the relations of time and place, there was not time, it would seem, for Price to have moved with considerable effect upon Nashville, as Bragg had ordered him to do. At all events, his long circuitous movement to join Van Dorn was a waste of force, even apart from the disastrous termination of that movement in the battle of Corinth (October 4, 1862). Buell's army was exposed to very serious risk in the movement from Nashville upon Louisville, and that risk would have been greatly increased if Price had moved as rapidly as possible upon Nashville. General Bragg was a commander who seems to have been very uncertain in his action. At times he was both skilful in his arrangements and enterprising in his movements. Suddenly his skill deserted him at the most critical moments. During his bold but useless invasion of Kentucky, he was, no doubt, right in considering that everything depended on a proper coöperation between him and General Kirby Smith. No doubt the authorities at Richmond were largely to blame for not definitely appointing one man to command the joint expedition from the moment the invasion of Kentucky had been determined upon. Nevertheless, from the evidence before us, it seems clear that Bragg was supplied with sufficient information as to Buell's move to have enabled him to fall upon Buell's flank during his march from Nashville to Louisville.

The decisive effect of such a move was so obvious that Bragg would clearly have been able to call upon General Smith to support him, and the junction of the two forces ought to have been made by Smith's junction with Bragg rather than by Bragg joining Smith. It is difficult to see how, if Bragg, supported as rapidly as possible by Smith, had fallen upon Buell during the march,—still more, if simultaneously, as Bragg wished, Price had

moved upon Nashville, instead of moving round to join Van Dorn at Corinth,—Nashville or Louisville could have escaped falling into the hands of the Confederate generals. Probably in that case they would have been able to strike back in time to intercept the retreat of the Union force from Cumberland Gap. If, as the Confederate writers seem to believe, the effect of so great a success would have been to induce Kentucky to throw itself heartily into the cause of the South, the result would have been most important. Without that, it is obvious that just as Lee's invasion of Pennsylvania caused numbers of the local militia to come to the aid of the Union forces, so the approach of Bragg's army to the borders of Ohio and Indiana tended to raise fresh armies against him. No doubt much of the relative ill-success, in proportion to numbers, which subsequently attended Buell's movement may be attributed to the rawness of that general's troops, who were little better than mere recruits, whilst Bragg's men had been trained to war in several campaigns. In the action of Perryville (October 8, 1862), which followed upon Buell's gradual concentration of force at Louisville, and the consequent retreat of Bragg, Buell evidently succeeded in imposing upon Bragg as to the direction in which he intended to move. Bragg's success in the fight and his successful retreat afterwards appear to have been very much the result of his possessing an army much better in hand and more experienced in fighting than it was possible for Buell to have collected under the circumstances at the time.

Though not prepared to modify the opinion expressed elsewhere, that General Lee was the most remarkable man the Civil War produced, and though I cannot admit that General Grant possessed at all the same genius for command, yet it must be at once confessed that it is an immense relief to turn from the mirage of these indecisive battles and movements in the West to the story of the Vicksburg campaign. It is very natural that General Sherman should rate very highly the military genius of General Grant, for the great services which, in the summer of 1863, Grant rendered to the Union made him tower head and shoulders over all others who could possibly be placed in supreme command of the Federal armies. McClellan had become by this time a political character, and as long as Mr. Lincoln remained President it was impossible that he should be again appointed Commander-in-Chief. The elections had already begun to show

the effect which the depression caused by Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville was producing throughout the North. Halleck, applying to a campaign which he could not stop till its success was assured the mischievous interference which had been in the East so fruitful in disaster, at last palpably stultified himself, even in the eyes of the President and the Cabinet. The scheme of the Vicksburg campaign was both original and brilliant in conception, and vigorous and fortunate in execution. Sherman, loyally anxious to acknowledge his own opposition to it, contributed, no doubt, largely to cause the military skill which Grant had shown to be appreciated throughout the country.

In its general character of sudden movement, by which he enlisted on the side of his army the advantages of surprise by a concentrated force, unentangled by any line of supplies, the Vicksburg campaign closely resembles many of Jackson's operations. It had something of the character of his campaign in the Shenandoah Valley, and something that recalled his movements which preceded the second Bull Run. The news of such strokes as Grant delivered in rapid succession at Port Gibson, South Fork, Fourteen-Mile Creek, Raymond, Jackson, Champion's Hill, and Big Black River, coming at a moment when gold had gone up to a figure hitherto unknown, and in the very weeks which immediately succeeded Chancellorsville and preceded Lee's invasion of Pennsylvania, must, indeed, have seemed like a sudden break of light through the darkest of clouds. No wonder, therefore, that public attention became concentrated on the siege of Vicksburg. The very fact that six weeks elapsed before the surrender was probably in favor of Grant's reputation. It gave time for representative people from the North to gather in the besieger's lines, and hear from the victorious army all the particulars about the successful campaign, and to learn how entirely it depended for its conception and execution upon the skill of one man, and upon the confidence which he had inspired in his subordinates.

When, almost at the same moment, the fall of Vicksburg and the battle of Gettysburg made the 4th of July, 1863, almost a new birthday for the Union, the general self-congratulation of the North made all hearts crave for a hero—for some one in whom to feel confidence. All this tended greatly, and very naturally, to increase the importance of Grant's position. In the West, the work accomplished and the victories achieved were palpably

Grant's own, but from the first the general public, at least, seem to have refused to Meade the honors of the battle which had been won under his orders. When, in consequence of the defeat at Chickamauga, the virtual investment of Rosecrans's army in Chattanooga, and the unhappy condition of Burnside's army at Knoxville, the aspect of affairs in the West again became gloomy and threatening, it followed as a matter of course that General Grant should be intrusted with the task of restoring the Union affairs in the West.

General Bragg seems to have shown, in the campaigns which had intervened since his retreat from Kentucky, a strange mixture of qualities. At the battle of Stone's River he successfully planned and carried out an attack upon the right flank of Rosecrans's army. But when everything was going in his favor, he abandoned his advantage, and, instead of crushing in the defeated wing upon the other wing, made a gratuitous attack upon the strongest intact position left to the enemy, and at a point where his previous success gave him no advantage. Rosecrans skilfully manœuvred Bragg out of his defensive positions, and forced him back beyond Chattanooga in June and July, 1863. The art of finding out the position, movements, and intentions of the enemy is the A B C of generalship. Of this art General Bragg was not only ignorant, but he lacked even the power to put together into one intelligible whole the information daily supplied by his outposts and obtained from other sources. At Chickamauga the victory was clearly in no way due to Bragg, and his incapacity to realize the nature of the situation presented to him was very much alike at the two battles of Stone's River and Chickamauga. He seems in the first instance to have contrived with considerable skill the virtual investment of Rosecrans in Chattanooga, but it is difficult to understand why, if his force was sufficient to allow him to detach Longstreet at all, he should not have attacked Bridgeport before the arrival of Hooker's troops. To have done so would have deprived the Union troops of their only means of constructing boats within reach of the beleaguered army. Bragg seems to have relapsed into a condition of careless confidence after the important positions round Chattanooga had been, in the first instance, secured. So much so that things were left in a condition which only required that a vigorous leader should restore confidence to the army of the Union to make it certain that

the besiegers would lose all the results of their previous successes.

So far as one may judge from the papers contributed to this series, those who fought under Grant at Chattanooga are by no means disposed to credit him with any great share in the work of opening the "cracker line," or even in planning the battle itself. I am disposed to think that they hardly do General Grant justice. It may be very true that the apparently splendid effect which, as the broad results only were heard of at a distance, appeared to attend the placing of Grant in command of the army and the dismissal of Rosecrans, was something of a *coup de théâtre*. It may be very true that the arrangements for opening communications had been at least partly planned under Rosecrans before Grant's arrival at Chattanooga, on the 23d October, 1863, and that they were mainly the work of subordinates. It may be true that, in the actual moment of victory at that place, the successful charge of Thomas was due to the spontaneous enthusiasm of the men, and that it was actually carried out in excess of Grant's intention or order. If it be assumed that Grant trusted entirely for his success to Sherman's attack upon the Confederate right, or trusted for success even to the combined effect of Sherman's and of Hooker's movement, it is no doubt true that Grant's original plan was not carried out. Grant certainly made many changes in his plans of attack, but surely this sort of criticism is not by any means fair to a general commanding an army in battle! The changes of plans seem to have been only such as the changing circumstances rendered necessary. General Grant acknowledges that Rosecrans offered him many most valuable suggestions, and rather pithily says: "My only surprise was that he had not carried them out." This may or may not be quite fair to Rosecrans, and it may be the case that the arrangements were being worked out as rapidly as circumstances admitted before Grant's arrival. But, taking the whole of the facts as they stand, it seems clear that while Grant, as any sensible man in his case would have done, took advantage of whatever had been effected before his arrival that promised to be useful, and listened to all suggestions that were likely to assist in the solution of a very difficult problem, nevertheless it was his energy and skill which carried the whole of the scheme through the great victory of Chattanooga. No doubt, as continually occurs in war, things did not happen exactly in the way he had designed they should

happen, but he was ready to do the best thing that was to be done under all the fresh circumstances as they arose. The actual working-out, the general superintendence of the whole scheme, were his and his alone.

The panic which appears at the last in that battle to have seized upon a portion of the Confederate Army was not, I think, the improbable event General Bragg seems to have considered it. Nothing tells so much on the confidence and courage of an army as the conviction that their general has been outmanœuvred by the enemy. Now, his army, it seems, never had any very special confidence in Bragg, and every misfortune is possible to the army that has no confidence in its leader. The battle of Chickamauga, and the knowledge that he had actually absented himself from the field under the belief that the battle was lost, must have greatly diminished their faith in him, even in the moment of victory. Then, after their successful investment of the Union army in Chattanooga, with everything to raise their spirits and depress those of their opponents, there came upon them one blow after another; first, the opening of the "cracker line," which meant, as they well knew, that there was no longer any hope of seeing the Federal Army surrender from want of food and ammunition; then the successive reënforcements of the Federals, the arrival of Hooker and of Sherman, the most unwise withdrawal of Longstreet's force, and of the detachments sent afterwards to reënforce him, just before Grant was ready to attack. Then came the successful ruse and surprise by which Thomas carried the outposts and picket-lines of the besiegers, and took up a threatening position all along the front of their works; then General Hooker, by the successful employment of superior forces against a weak part of the Confederate line, necessitated the withdrawal of their troops from Lookout Mountain; and then came Sherman's successful surprise of their pickets on the right, by means of which he contrived to get his troops across the river without loss, and to establish them, unknown to his enemy, on their right flank.

I think one may well guess what must have been the effect of all these Federal operations upon the minds of the Confederate soldiers. It is quite true that little material advantage was actually gained by Grant by his attack on the Chattanooga position. But each succeeding event tended to depress the spirits of the

Confederate Army, to shake their confidence in their leaders, whilst, on the other hand, every fresh move of Grant's tended to restore confidence to the Federal troops, and to make them believe they were being skilfully led. There is a sense in which, with armies as with individuals, deep depression, when once relieved, tends to pass rapidly into a condition of high exaltation, all the more effective because of the reaction from the previous opposite feeling. The army under the command of General Thomas, after all the misery and starvation they had courageously endured, seem to have passed through these phases. Nothing could have been better calculated to excite in them an extreme and passionate desire to go through any sacrifice for victory than that they should be kept for some time idly waiting in front of the enemy, whose forward position they had already seized, and compelled to witness the fighting being done for them by the armies that had come to relieve them—by Sherman on their left, and by Hooker on their right.

Those are circumstances under which you may securely trust Anglo-Saxon troops, at least when once released from the leash, to go forward, as those of General Thomas did, with a bound that carries everything before it, and that probably exceeds both your wishes and your orders. The apparently-sudden change in temperament of their opponents seems to have been all that was needed to convert the discouragement of the Southerners into actual flight. Grant certainly deserves all possible credit for having, within the time between his arrival and the battle of Chattanooga, done so much thus to change the condition of the *morale* of his own army, and of that which was opposed to it. He further deserves the credit of having realized how important that change was to him, and how advantage could best be taken of it. The story told in these papers is a fitting introduction to the time when Grant was to be transferred to a yet higher command, and to be pitted against very different opponents from Generals Bragg and Pemberton.

It is rather curious that this third volume on the Civil War should close with an account of Longstreet's first independent command, in which, far from remaining perpetually on the defensive, he committed himself to the particularly bloody attack upon Knoxville, which, ill-prepared and ill-advised, ended in failure.

WOLSELEY.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

ERICSSON AND HIS "MONITOR."

BY CHARLES W. MACCORD, SC.D., PROFESSOR OF MECHANICAL DRAWING, STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY.
(FORMERLY CHIEF DRAUGHTSMAN FOR CAPTAIN JOHN ERICSSON.)

THE 8th of March twenty-seven years ago has become historic as a day of defeat and gloomy portent, when the sinking of the "Cumberland" and the burning of the "Congress" destroyed at a blow all confidence in the strength of our navy, and spread dismay at the defenceless condition of our seacoast towns.

And by the association of ideas the 8th of March is still more strongly emphasized; it is the black-letter day on the calendar of the present year, for then the busy brain of the world's most illustrious engineer ceased forever from its labors. The events of the earlier time are vividly recalled by the death of Ericsson, whose name will always have something of magic in it; for it was he who enabled us to retrieve that reverse, who lifted the pall of despondency which overshadowed the land, and did more than any other single man to preserve the integrity of the Union. The speediness of the revenge, too, fitly harmonized with his energetic nature; on the very next day, in the very same place, while seeking new victories, the conqueror met defeat; not in a dream, and scarcely by a miracle, could the dramatic effect have been enhanced.

Nor is there upon record a coincidence more striking or more suggestive: in the darkness of the early morning, the great designer set sail upon the unknown sea, on the anniversary of the very day when his little ship had come to anchor in the roadstead, in the darkness of the evening,—a darkness soon to be dispelled by the splendors of a triumph, which for all coming time has fixed his name and hers in golden letters upon the tablets of our history.

The story of the "Monitor's" building has been often told: the fertility of invention, facility in designing, speed and accuracy in drawing, promptness in execution, and unwearied industry which made the construction possible in so short a time—all these are familiar. But the minor mishaps, the special incidents which, apparently adverse, yet proved providential as contributing to that exact coincidence of time, place, and circumstance upon which so much depended—these have as yet been omitted in the telling, and without them the story is incomplete.

While the vessel was on the stocks, Captain Ericsson made frequent and for a part of the time daily visits to the yard of the Continental Works, watching operations with a keen and critical eye; but after the launch he considered this no longer necessary, and visited her but seldom. In this way it came about that, although the motive engines were put in before launching, he did not see them under steam, but contented himself with the reports of their action made by the government engineers. These engines were of what has ever since been called the "Monitor type," and many have supposed that they were, like the vessel itself, of wholly novel and untried design. This, however, was not the case. In the "Judith" and the "Daylight," and elsewhere, this form of engine had already demonstated its practical working qualities: otherwise the captain would probably have given the first trials at the dock his personal supervision.

For obvious reasons, as little publicity as possible had been given to the work during its progress, but perfect secrecy was, of course, out of the question. The turret of a monitor can not be hidden under a bushel, nor could the launching of an iron-clad vessel be concealed from the public eye; and, indeed, it had been watched by some in expectation that this strange craft, built in defiance of everything considered ship-shape, apparently overweighted with iron, and with no free-board worth mentioning, would slide off the ways straight to the bottom of the East River and never come up again. Disappointed of this sensation, the public had manifested no little curiosity to see how the "Ericsson Battery" would behave when she left the dock. This curiosity was soon gratified; the final preparations were pushed with unabated vigor, and, the engines having been reported in satisfactory working order, upon one gloomy winter's day a formal trial trip was made.

The result of this trial was anything but encouraging, as reported in the daily papers, one of which made it the text of a "crushing" article, wherein, under the heading of "ERICSSON'S FOLLY," the battery was pronounced an ignominious failure, which could neither be propelled nor steered; the captain was called an incapable schemer, and a stern reproof was given for the sin of thus wasting the country's resources;—no words too harsh, no denunciations too severe, for the zeal of this fiery crusader. The versatility of the modern journalist stood him in good stead on the 10th of March, when the novel fighting machine had proved invulnerable to heavier blows than his pen could deal; but in the meantime it must be admitted that the battery had not behaved as well as she might. The motive engines were not in proper adjustment, the steering-gear required excessive power, and between the two the vessel proved unmanageable; the trial was given up, and she had to be towed back—a rude disappointment indeed to expectations which no one conversant with all the facts can regard as unreasonable.

It is well known that John Ericsson was by nature sanguine and enthusiastic; impetuous, excitable, and impatient of contradiction, with him it was "*Sic volo, sic jubeo, stet pro ratione voluntas*"; nor did he always in the heat of the moment consider whether his wishes could be executed by those not endowed with his own tireless energy. The events of that dismal day must have vexed his very soul, but the manner in which he bore them was strikingly characteristic. Had they been trifling things, he would have been exasperated, as his custom was, and exasperating, too, when small affairs went wrong; but under heavy burdens his broad shoulders never bent, and he looked always squarely in the face of grave misfortunes with calm and resolute eyes. It is true that on his return to Franklin Street, where he then resided, there was a somewhat portentous cloud upon his face, and no wonder; but it was not the forerunner of a storm.

At his request I brought the drawings of the valve gear, not without misgivings, for he had never examined them with a view to verification, and I alone was responsible for their accuracy. He wanted the plan showing the relative positions of the eccentrics and the main crank; and I was obliged to explain that I had no original, having made the working tracing, in order to save time, from detached drawings and a pencil diagram. He

listened with patience and appeared satisfied with my detailed explanation, and then requested me to make a new drawing of the complete arrangement, trace it, and as soon as possible to call in the old plan, give out the new one, and give orders to have the eccentrics at once set according to it. I was then informed that during all the trials at the dock the engines had been running *backward*, of which Chief-Engineer Stimers, who, it seems, had never inquired whether the propeller were right-handed or left-handed, was not aware. Simple reversal would not, at best, have fully met the difficulty; for each slide valve was driven by a loose eccentric, which was shifted part way round in order to reverse—an arrangement which, if adjusted to give the best results in one direction, will not in that type of engine do equally well in the other. Still this could not have been the whole secret, though it was never discovered just what was; for the subsequent difference between the forward and backward running was never great enough to have caused so much trouble; and, again, the same device was used in many engines of the same form afterward, about which no complaint was made.

Be that as it may, I did not feel like taking the responsibility of giving out the new plan without his scrutiny; but he would not look at it, only saying: "You are sure it is right now? Very well; then go ahead." I did so, and, having captured the first tracing, lost no time in comparing it with the new drawing; to my great relief, they tallied exactly, so that both tracings might have been made from the same original plan.

Some time after, meeting the superintendent of the Delamater Works, I tried to ascertain the real cause of the difficulty, but without success. He asserted that the first drawings of the valve gear were all wrong, admitted that the new ones were all right, and averred that the plans had been carefully followed in both cases. After a brief explanation, I invited him to accompany me to No. 95 Franklin Street and compare the old with the new; but he found that he had not time. Captain Ericsson had once described this superintendent as "too stupid to make a blunder," which only proves that his own judgment was not infallible; but whatever the precise nature or cause of this annoying maladjustment, it is absolutely certain that it was due to no error or oversight at headquarters. And it was so quickly rectified that the trifling delay arising from this cause alone would not have pre-

vented the "Monitor" from meeting her adversary before the eventful 9th of March.

She had become unmanageable, not only from the temporary failure of her engines, but from want of control over her steering-gear. The cause of this was that her rudder was somewhat overbalanced; the area forward of the rudder-post being too great in proportion to that aft of it. In these circumstances, the rudder, once thrown over to either side, does not readily return, but opposes considerable resistance to any effort to bring it back to its central position. Those who choose may attribute this to miscalculation; but it is for them to prove that under all the conditions, known and unknown, the exact proportion which shall require the least power can be determined by any known means. At any rate, there was the hard, uncomfortable fact; it was not the hour, nor was Ericsson the man, to indulge in idle speculations as to how or why it came there; but had he adopted the remedy suggested to him, it is morally certain that the battle between the giant and the pygmy would not have occurred when and where it did.

This remedy was neither more nor less than the replacing of the balanced rudder by one of different form. I do not know where the idea originated, nor do I say that any formal proposal was made, but in some way the captain became aware of an intention of the naval authorities to have the vessel put in the dry-dock and fitted with a new rudder. The hot Scandinavian blood flushed his cheek, his eyes gleamed, his brow darkened; and this time the storm broke in all its fury. With the full volume of his tremendous voice, and with a mighty oath, he thundered: "The 'Monitor' is MINE, and I say it shall not be done." Presently he added, in a tone of supreme contempt: "Put in a new rudder! They would waste a month in doing that; I will make her steer just as easily in three days."

My recollection is that it was done in less time. No change in the rudder was even thought of, and the change in the steering-gear was the simplest possible. Her tiller consisted of an arc of iron, with two angle-irons on the outer side; round each of these was wound a chain, which, running around a pulley below the deck, was attached to a wire tiller-rope leading forward to the pilot-house, and coiled in the usual manner round the drum of the steering-wheel. By Captain Ericsson's direction, the wire

ropes were now detached from the chains, to each of which a snatch-block was made fast; a short chain was connected at one end to each tiller-rope, run through one of these blocks, brought back parallel to itself, and secured at the other end to a deck-beam. The purchase being thus doubled, the trouble was over and the vessel steered with ease.

Considering how precious were the moments then, the suggestion of a new rudder might well excite his indignation and disgust. But the captain's wrath was chiefly roused by the idea of any official interference with the vessel as yet unpaid for and wholly in his own hands; which was perfectly natural in view of his treatment by the government in this and other matters. It will be always recorded in the history of this country that the building of the "Monitor" was sanctioned by the authorities at Washington only upon conditions the most arbitrary and, in the circumstances, the most contemptible, ever imposed by a great government upon a great designer. At a price barely sufficient to cover the cost of materials and labor, they would accept his battery, but not until it had proved impregnable under the guns of the enemy at the shortest range; in a most critical emergency, they would take all the profit if he would take all the risk. Twenty years before, these United States had reaped the fruit of his genius and his labor, when the building of the "Princeton" had also marked a new era in naval construction. During all those years they had refused, as they have refused during all the longer years since, to pay him for his services, although in the meantime there had been days when the paltry sum would have been most acceptable; they are willing, it seems, that the memory of their meanness shall be everlasting, since they have allowed him to carry it with him to his eternal rest.

Nevertheless, as then in time of peace he had prepared them for war, so now in time of war he was ready to prepare them for peace, and that upon their own one-sided, almost humiliating, terms. To accept those terms was an act of magnanimity, and a proof, were any needed, that what he soon after said to me was true,—"I love this country. I love its people and its laws; and I would give my life for it just as soon as not." Patriotic he was, but also he was proud; the sting of the earlier injustice still rankled, and it was only at the earnest solicitation of a friend that he consented to appear in Washington to demonstrate that

he was conferring a boon, not soliciting a favor. But for which it might not have happened that in this country and for this country were built the two most conspicuous of the many monuments of his genius that mark his path all the way from the cottage in Vermland to the halls of Valhalla.

The trial of the armament also contributed its quota to the general result, in a manner which proved to be amusing, though the consequences narrowly escaped being disastrous. It must first be explained that the friction for taking up the recoil was produced by means of two levers, actuated by a screw, with a hand-wheel at the side of the gun-carriage. Since there were two guns, pointing in the same direction, with very little space between them, the hand-wheels were, of course, placed on the outer sides of the carriages; naturally suggesting the idea that the whole mechanism was right-handed for one and left-handed for the other. But this was not so; in order to save time it was made the same for each, and in serving either gun the compression was effected by turning the top of the wheel to the left. Now, screws are ordinarily turned the other way in order to produce pressure; and Chief-Engineer Stimers, by whom the trial was conducted, would seem not to have made himself acquainted with the construction here adopted. Grasping the hand-wheel of gun No. 1, he turned it *to the right* until the resistance in his judgment indicated a proper degree of compression, and gave the order to fire. It must next be stated that the first effect of his action was to relieve any pressure that might have existed; the second effect was that the levers, whose movement was quite limited, became jammed in the supporting brackets, thus causing the resistance which had completely deceived the chief engineer. The great weapon gave a sullen roar, and, being entirely free, flew back until it was stopped by the cascabel striking against the interior of the turret.

One would imagine this experience sufficient to inspire caution; but, curiously enough, Engineer Stimers seems to have assumed that the carriages must be rights and lefts, and to have concluded that what was thus proved wrong for one was exactly the correct thing for the other. And so, without looking under the gun to see what was there and make sure of what he was really doing, he at once proceeded to experiment with gun No. 2 in the same manner, and with precisely similar results. Thus

both guns were temporarily disabled, though, strange to say, neither was dismounted, nor were the carriages broken. The actual damage was surprisingly small, consisting chiefly in the shearing off of some bolts which secured the bearings of the guide-rollers to the carriages; these, however, were not easily accessible, and the repairs necessarily consumed some little time.

Now, it may be safely said that without the occurrence of these things, or of any one of them, the course of affairs at that critical period would have been materially changed. The minor as well as the major planets must be consulted in casting the horoscope, and trivial as such incidents might seem in ordinary times, each had its share in fixing the day and the hour of a mighty contest, and the fortunes of a nation depended on the twist of a screw-thread. By far the most important one, as measured by its possible consequences, was the trouble with the steering-gear, though from the simplicity of the remedy it might appear the most insignificant; and it was this that brought into the boldest relief the prominent traits of the captain's character His keen mechanical instinct, quick decision, firmness of resolve, his fiery spirit, his energy in action, were all conspicuous ; but all these were dominated by self-reliance and his pride in originality.

He loved to do his own work in his own way, and his fertility of expedient was something marvellous ; to quote his own words on another occasion, "If I ever do get into a scrape, I know exactly how to get out of it"; and men unlike him, as most men are, were more likely than he to follow the lines laid down by others. He had said, "The 'Monitor' is mine," and his she was, in another and to him a far dearer sense ; from turret to keel-plate, from rudder-shoe to anchor-well, every distinctive feature was the creation of his brain ; every detail was stamped with the evidence of his handiwork. It was he who had planned the mechanism which had sulkily refused to obey his will, and he, or no man, should dictate the change which would reduce it to subjection. How much we owe to this one instance of determined resolution it is not easy to say. It prevented a fatal delay at a momentous crisis, and was thus the cause of that unparalleled change in national feeling which followed, when in every hamlet it was told, "The Ericsson Battery has saved the Union." It seized the golden moment of opportunity ; it changed defeat

into victory—victory which revolutionized naval warfare, wrung from England the reluctant admission, "Yesterday we had a great navy; to-day we have but two war-ships worthy of the name," and compelled our own government to exhibit a tardy confidence in the genius of the man whom it has persistently wronged. A grim testimonial of the fact that this confidence was not misplaced lies in the Royal Museum at Stockholm—a fifteen-inch shell with this significant inscription:

GUSTAVUS VASA FOX

Fann denna kula bland Sumters ruiner. *

And it would have been well had either of two other things been done as he wished. He had hoped for fifteen-inch guns; but they could not be procured in time. The largest available were eleven-inch, from which were fired only shells, with a service charge of fifteen pounds; against which the armor of the "Merrimac" was just strong enough to be proof. Foreseeing this, he had provided wrought-iron solid shot, to be used with a greater charge: not one was fired. The occasion would have warranted some little advance on previous practice, even if not advised by so thorough an expert as Captain Ericsson unquestionably was; that it was not made was no fault of either officers or crew, than whom no braver men ever trod a deck or served a gun; and the soundness of his judgment was proved by the subsequent use of double the quantity of powder. Had the government been able to furnish the heavier guns, or its officials been willing to sanction the heavier charges, there is little doubt that the "Merrimac" would have been quickly sent to keep company with her victims.

This had seemed to the captain so surely attainable with the means at hand that he could not regard the actual result with pleasure wholly unalloyed. Still it brought him a triumphant vindication of his bold defiance of precedent, the proud consciousness of a great service rendered to the country of his choice, the applause of a startled world, the enthusiastic gratitude of half a continent. Well might a feeling of elation take

* Gustavus Vasa Fox found this shot in the ruins of Sumter.

full possession of mind and soul, and overcome for the time not only the will, but the power, to pursue ordinary vocations. But no ordinary man was here: exultant, proud, and happy he was—no one who saw him could doubt that; but his steadfast mind did not swerve from the even tenor of its path, nor were his usual occupations interrupted for a single day. The fighting ability of the turret ship was established beyond a question, but her sea-going qualities were still held in doubt; and hardly had the echoes died away in Hampton Roads before he sat down quietly to plan a fleet of still greater pugnacious power; one of which, besides, was yet to round Cape Horn and enter the Golden Gate, another to visit his native Sweden and anchor under the guns of Cronstadt, while a third, sent to sea like a child in leading-strings, under the care of an escort, repaid the motherly attention by towing her disabled convoy safely into port;—and thus it was proved that the monitors were fully competent to take care of themselves, of their enemies, and of their friends.

The captain was disappointed that the "Monitor" had not done her utmost during the engagement; by her subsequent inactivity he was simply enraged. He was, himself, the active voice incarnate, and the passive voice was to him absolutely incomprehensible; like the hot and angry bee, who never rests, and wonders how others can, he saw in the end of one task only the beginning of another. He had built his ship to *fight;* and I never heard him allude to the "excessive caution" which kept her idle after her one battle, without scathing denunciations couched in language as fluent as it was vigorous, and more uncomplimentary than either. Both things appear the more to be regretted in the light of subsequent events, since they afforded a pretext for the shameless tirade of Winter Davis, who said: "The 'Monitor' and the 'Merrimac' met by accident in Hampton Roads; neither whipped, and the world went wild over two guns in a cheese-box." To be sure, the point is taken out of this sting when the armaments are compared; ten guns against two is heavy odds, and there would have been enough to admire had the smaller vessel but held her own. And though our own excited people might easily make an exaggerated estimate of the result, the spectators often judge the game better that the interested players, and the world at large does not go wild over a drawn battle. Still the shallow orator spoke more truly than he knew or meant when he

said they met by chance, for though the "Monitor" was designed expressly to fight the "Merrimac," their meeting then and there hinged upon circumstances which were, humanly speaking, accidental, if anything ever was.

It is not suprising that the fervor of an enthusiasm caused by such sudden and unexpected deliverance from impending disaster should, in a manner, overdo itself, and give rise to expectations altogether too extravagant to be realized, nor yet that this should be followed by a reaction; a populace, with proverbial fickleness, unduly depreciating what had before been, perhaps, too highly extolled. But whatever may be said in extenuation of utterances made while feelings and opinions were thus fluctuating, nothing can be urged upon such grounds after the normal level has been resumed. Still it is sometimes said now, as it was often said then, in a derogatory sense, that Captain Ericsson made many mistakes, and that he persistently refused to accept the suggestions of others. It cannot be denied that both these things are true, but the recoil of this weapon is its only dangerous feature; for due account must be taken of the new and original work which he accomplished, thereby making himself a tremendous factor in the material progress of the world during the present century. He was versatile and prolific in ideas to an extent seldom approached, his work being no less remarkable for its variety than for its intrinsic importance, while its amount was simply astounding; so that its execution, even with his unrivalled celerity, would have been impossible without uninterrupted application. Plenty there were who were willing, many much more than they were able, to give advice. Had he taken time to listen to it all, the record of what he has done would have been much shorter than it is.

Mistakes he made, and he knew it; his projects were not always successful. In exploring new fields, errors are often found assuming the garb of truth so effectually that the imposition is not at once detected; in the development of new ideas perfection is seldom reached without repeated trials; and to say that the captain made mistakes is simply to affirm that he was human; but when they are compared with the total results of his labors, the ratio is so small that no one has yet laid stress upon them who would not, in the caustic words of John Bourne, "have been a much more distinguished engineer than he is if he had

never done anything in his life except to contrive the mistakes of Ericsson."

I have already alluded to a protest made against "the wasting of the people's money" before the first of the monitors was completed. It is singular enough that, when the last of them had been for years out of commission, the same stupid cry of indignation was repeated in reference to the highly-finished machinery of the largest of the turret ships. The absurdity of the first complaint was very soon made evident; and the second was equally without foundation, for the money thus expended was not the people's money. But what if it had been? Who, I ask, in the name of all that is just, of all that is generous, of all that is patriotic, had a better right to waste a little of it, if waste it can be called, than the man who, at the risk of his own thousands, had saved the people from the loss of unknown millions?

Such utterances serve only to show the depths to which it is possible for little minds to descend. For the very lowest standard by which such works as his can be gauged is that of money value; and leaving out of the account the advances which he had already made in naval warfare, and considering only the effects of his previous career upon the peaceful arts, upon commercial enterprise, and general material prosperity, it is easy to show that the gain directly traceable to his single-handed exertions is great almost beyond computation. The people were very largely indebted to him for the magnitude of the interests at stake;—in a word, he had done more to develop this country than he did even to defend it. Either was a more than sufficient foundation for enduring fame, but with the latter his name will be always more closely associated by every true American; and simply as the builder of the "Monitor," it is safe to say that the memory of John Ericsson will be green in the minds of men long after not only carping criticisms, but the critics themselves, with their records, their achievements and all, shall have been sunk fathoms deep in the everlasting limbo of forgotten things.

CHARLES W. MACCORD.

LORD WOLSELEY'S MISTAKES.*

BY JEFFERSON DAVIS.

LORD WOLSELEY has twice conspicuously assumed the part of a self-appointed judge of certain military problems presented by the war between the States, and has presumed to pronounce his decisions in a tone of authority that, viewing his capacity, amuses, and, viewing his record, amazes, the reader competent to judge between the critic and the movements and men he has undertaken to criticise. In THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for May he returns with increased venom to his attack on the Confederate Executive. As his reference to me is so manifestly dragged into his article, and so transparently an ebullition of temper, I had not intended to notice it. But I have been so earnestly urged by personal friends in both sections, in the interest of historical truth, to refute Lord Wolseley's slanderous perversions of Confederate history that I reluctantly yield my personal inclination to reply to him in the pages of THE REVIEW.

My reluctance to engage in the controversy relating to the war between the States is not personal only, but rests on considerations of public interest; for such controversies give occasion to demagogues for reviving old animosities that are injurious to the general welfare—animosities which, unless stimulated, will surely and speedily disappear. But, on the other hand, in order that crimination and recrimination between the States may forever cease, it is needful that the truth, and the whole truth, should be known, and not perverted in the interest of faction. An *entente cordiale* cannot rest on a partisan pedestal.

* General Wolseley having criticised the Hon. Jefferson Davis in one of his articles, it seems but fair that the ex-President of the Confederacy should have an opportunity to reply. At the same time, it should be remembered, in justice to General Wolseley, that that distinguished soldier expressly states that his articles deal only with the information supplied by *The Century's* history of the Civil War; and he cannot be held responsible for deficiencies in that source of information.—EDITOR NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

For my own part in the contest between the sections I have no excuses to make and no apology to offer. I did my duty to the best of my ability, according to the faith in which I was reared and to which I adhere. What is true in my own case is equally true of my associates. Instead of being "traitors," we were loyal to our States; instead of being rebels against the Union, we were defenders of the Constitution as framed by its founders and as expounded by them. Taught by them to regard the State as sovereign and the Federal Government as the agent, not the ruler, of the State, we loyally followed the lead of the sovereign and resisted the usurpations of the agent. We do not fear the verdict of posterity on the purity of our motives or the sincerity of our belief, which our sacrifices and career sufficiently attested.

But while we of the South have no desire to keep alive the controversies of the war, it is equally due to our own self-respect and a duty to our dead associates to repel the unjust aspersions that it has been sought to fasten on the motives and conduct of the leaders of the Confederacy.

In previous attacks Lord Wolseley contented himself, as he does in the first few pages of his first NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW article, with speaking of me in a tone of lofty disparagement, without condescending to give specific reasons for his unfavorable opinion. But now, after a somewhat Olympian sentence of condemnation, the Adjutant-General incautiously gives a condensed bill of particulars, as if to justify his unfavorable opinion. He writes:

"It may be said that it was impossible for any one to foresee the dimensions to which the struggle would grow. But surely it is a statesman's business at least partially to gauge the strength of the forces with which he has to deal. The *soi-disant* statesman who began his high duties with the avowed expectation that 10,000 Enfield rifles would be sufficient to overawe the United States; who then refused the services of 366,000 men, the flower of the South, and accepted only a fraction of them, because he had not arms for more; the man who neglected to buy the East Indian fleet, which happy chance and the zeal of subordinates threw in his way; the ruler who could not see that the one vital necessity for the South was, at all sacrifice and at all hazard, to keep the ports open; who rejected all means proposed by others for placing the finances of the Confederacy on a sound basis,—that man, as I think, did more than any other individual on either side to save the Union. I have not attempted to make the charge against him as complete and crushing as it could easily be made by those who trusted him with almost unlimited powers in their behalf."

Specifications are always needed to give credence, if not currency, to false accusations against men in representative official positions; but as the acts of such men are necessarily of public

record, they enjoy a facility of refutation rarely accorded to men in more private stations.

I might well be ashamed of my public career if I could feel that the opinion of any European stripling without an earned record of ability either in civil or military life could affect my reputation in America, and therefore I pass unnoticed his personal depreciation; but I should have graver cause to be ashamed of my administration of the Confederate Government if the allegations he makes, without proof or reference, were founded in fact.

Each and every allegation in Lord Wolseley's indictment, above quoted, is either false in direct statement or false by inference.

It is impossible, in the limited space you assign me, fully to refute all of Lord Wolseley's false statements by all the abundant proofs in contemporary records and books that I might easily submit; but in the restricted space placed at my disposal I shall notice each of his allegations as briefly as possible.

I.—"*The* soi-disant *statesman who began his high duties with the avowed expectation that 10,000 Enfield rifles would be sufficient to overawe the United States; who then refused the services of 366,000 men, the flower of the South, and accepted only a fraction of them, because he had not arms for more.*"

This assertion that 366,000 men, "the flower of the South," were offered to me and refused is so devoid of truth or probability that only the most reckless indifference to both could have uttered it. That in the then condition of the Confederate States there should have been such a numerous organization to offer itself is as incredible as that the President, who notoriously differed with most of his countrymen in apprehending a long and bloody war, should have declined the services of such a force. It is untrue as a whole and in every part. A writer of history may be expected to consult contemporaneous records rather than to accept the rumors of manifestly unfriendly writers. In this case, for example, reference might have been made to the Confederate law of that period.

In the act of March 6, 1861, "to provide for the public defence," the first section authorized the President of the Confederate States of America to ask for and accept the services of any number of volunteers, not exceeding 100,000, "to serve for twelve months, unless sooner discharged." By the second section

it is enacted that the volunteers, when mustered into service, should be armed by the States from which they came or by the Confederate States. By the fifth section the President was authorized to accept the volunteers in companies, squadrons, battalions, and regiments. From this it will be seen that the largest organization contemplated, or which the President was authorized to accept, was the regiment, and that, beyond the power of the Confederate Government to arm the volunteers, they were required to be armed by the States from which they came. The law treated the possession of arms as the condition on which volunteers might be accepted, but the English Adjutant-General, in haste to censure, does not stop to inquire whether his "men in buckram" *had* arms.

Again, a military critic should know that, although arms are indispensable, munitions of war are also absolutely essential to troops in campaign ; and his knowledge need not be very profound to lead him to the conclusion that ammunition was necessary to make guns effective. Of the early and active efforts made to obtain military supplies notice will be taken in the progress of this article.

There is not a shadow of a shade of truth in Lord Wolseley's statement that I began my duties as President of the Confederacy with "the avowed expectation that 10,000 Enfield rifles would be sufficient to overawe the United States." It is a fact of ineffaceable record that I publicly and always predicted a long and bloody struggle, and for that reason was often criticised and censured by the more ardent advocates of secession and termed "slow" and "too conservative." No Southern man had enjoyed better opportunities than my public life in Washington had given me to gauge the resources and predict the probable policy of the people of the North; for, as Senator, I had long and intimately associated with their representatives, and for four years had been United States Secretary of War. With such opportunities of ascertaining the power and sentiments of the Northern people, it would have shown an inexcusable want of perception if I had shared the hopes of men less favored with opportunities for forming correct judgments, in believing with them that secession could be or would be peacefully accomplished.

The absurdity of these statements may further be seen from the fact that, as appears from the official report of General Gor-

gas,* chief of ordnance of the Confederacy both under the provisional and the permanent government, there was in the armories of the Confederate States, subject to my order as Commander-in-Chief, a supply of arms, inadequate, indeed, for the needs of the country, but vastly in excess of the number that, according to my military-imaginative critic, I had declared sufficient to overawe the United States; and yet it is of public record that, even before I had selected the members of the provisional cabinet, or engaged a private secretary, or had any clerical assistance whatever, one of my first acts as Provisional President, at Montgomery, was to commission Captain (afterwards Admiral) Raphael Semmes to proceed north and purchase all the arms, ammunition, and other munitions of war, and the machinery for making them, that he could buy and have delivered. In Admiral Semmes's "Memoirs of Service Afloat," it will be found on page 82 and the following pages that he reached Montgomery on the 19th of February, 1861, the day after the inauguration of President Davis. He there states that he called upon the President, who conversed with him on the want of preparation for defence and asked Captain Semmes if he could make use of him, and explained his purpose to send him to the Northern States to gather together, with as much haste as possible, mechanics skilled in the manufacture and use of ordnance and rifle machinery, the preparation of fixed ammunition, percussion caps, etc. "He had not selected all his cabinet, nor, indeed, had he so much as a private secretary at his command, as the letter of instructions which he presented for my guidance was written with his own hand. This letter was very full and precise, frequently descending into detail and manifesting an acquaintance with bureau duties scarcely to have been expected," etc.

Subsequently, upon the appointment of Mr. Mallory as Sec-

* General Gorgas reports that at the formation of the government the small arms at command were 15,000 rifles and 120,000 muskets, stored at Fayetteville, Richmond, Charleston, Augusta, Mount Vernon (Ala.), and Baton Rouge. "Besides the foregoing, there were at Little Rock, Ark., a few thousand stands, and some few at the Texas arsenal, increasing the aggregate of serviceable arms to, say, 143,000. To these must be added the arms owned by the several States and by military organizations throughout the country, giving, say, 150,000 in all for the use of the armies of the Confederacy." That is, *fifteen-fold* more than, according to Lord Wolseley, I had "avowed" as necessary to "overawe" the United States. So earnest were the efforts made by the Confederate Government to increase this number of effective arms that the chief-of-ordnance report of July 1, 1863, shows that there was then a total of infantry arms, acquired from all sources, of 400,000.

retary of the Navy, he sent, March 13, 1861, a letter further instructing Captain Semmes to look out for any vessels suited for coast defence; and Captain Semmes writes: "Under these instructions I made diligent search in the waters of New York for such steamers as were wanted, but none could be found." Admiral Semmes adds:

"I found the people everywhere not only willing, but anxious, to contract with me. I purchased large quantities of percussion caps in the city of New York, and sent them by express without any disguise to Montgomery. I made contracts for batteries of light artillery, powder, and other munitions, and succeeded in getting large quantities of the powder shipped. I made a contract for removal to the Southern States of a complete set of machinery for rifling cannon, with the requisite skilled workmen to put it in operation."

The interference of the civil authorities prevented many of these contracts from being fulfilled at a later date.

General Gorgas, chief of ordnance, writes:

"As to a further supply of arms, steps had been taken by the President to import these and other ordnance stores from Europe, and Major Caleb Huse, graduate of West Point, and at that moment professor in the University of Alabama, was selected to go abroad and procure them. He left Montgomery under instructions from me early in April, 1861, with a credit of £10,000 from Mr. Memminger. The appointment proved a happy one; for he succeeded, with very little money, in contracting for a good supply and in running my department in debt for nearly half a million—the very best proof of his fitness for his place and of a financial ability which supplemented the narrowness of Mr. Memminger's purse."

II.—"*The man who neglected to buy the East Indian fleet, which happy chance and the zeal of subordinates threw in his way.*"

My first knowledge of the existence of such a story was derived from the New York *Sun* of November 17, 1878, in which appeared what purported to be an interview with General G. T. Beauregard to the effect that he had gone "with the messenger of Messrs. Frazer & Co. to Montgomery, had introduced the messenger to the Secretary of War, and took advantage of the opportunity to urge upon him the immediate adoption of the proposition, which was to buy some six large and strong steamers just built in England for the East India Company." I thereupon wrote to General L. P. Walker, ex-Secretary of War of the Confederate States, sending him the New York *Sun* and requesting such information as he might have in regard to the matter, and I received the following reply:

HUNTSVILLE, Ala., December 10, 1878.

Hon. JEFFERSON DAVIS, Beauvoir, Miss.

DEAR SIR: I have read the article in the New York *Sun*, which you enclosed in your letter to me of the 2d inst. I do not remember the interview with me men-

tioned by General Beauregard, nor that any proposition was submitted to the Confederate Government for the sale to it of any steamers of the character stated here. If any such proposition was made, it has passed from my recollection.

Yours respectfully,

L. P. WALKER.

To a like inquiry addressed to Mr. Memminger, ex-Secretary of the Confederate Treasury, he replied, on November 27, 1878 :

CHARLESTON, S. C., November 27, 1878.

Hon. JEFF DAVIS, Beauvoir, Miss.

MY DEAR SIR: I have no recollection of having heard of the proposition referred to by General Beauregard. I remember my having written to Mr. Trenholm, one of the firm of Jno. Frazer & Co., to come on to Montgomery to present the advantages of establishing a depot for cotton and munitions of war at Bermuda and some station in the West Indies, and that he came on and appeared before the Cabinet, and warmly advocated this plan, and that it met with my cordial approval, but it was not approved by the Cabinet.

I remember nothing of any proposal to purchase the steamers of the India Company. Mr. William Trenholm remembers his appearance before the Cabinet in behalf of the scheme above mentioned. His address was confined to that scheme, but he says he made the proposition to the Secretary of War and to Mr. Mallory, the Secretary of the Navy, to purchase the steamers of the Oriental Company, but that they had many grounds of objection to the purchase, such as the great draught of water, which would prevent their entering Southern ports.their construction of iron, and the want of money. He has no recollection of ever having spoken to me or you on the subject, nor did it enter into the statement made before the Cabinet; and as to myself, I have no recollection of having been consulted by either Mr. Mallory or the Secretary of the War.

Very truly yours,

C. G. MEMMINGER.

It would be needless to consider why I "refused" a proposition which was never made to me, and I can only remand both the refusal and the reason for it to the region of imagination from which they sprang.

The Confederate States, being without ship-yards and without skilled workmen with whom to build cruisers and to provide for coast defences, were compelled to look abroad both to buy and to build the vessels they required. Capt. J. D. Bullock, a well-known officer of the United States Navy, had, immediately after his resignation, reported at Montgomery for orders, and was selected to go abroad as our chief naval agent in Europe. He left Montgomery on May 9, 1861, to get cruising ships of suitable type afloat with the quickest possible despatch and to buy and forward naval supplies of all kinds without delay. Whoever has read his work, entitled "Secret Service of the Confederate States in Europe," will not fail to perceive how fortunate was the selection for

the vitally important duty on which he was sent abroad. The diligence and energy with which he filled the office intrusted to him are attested by the list of ships built and bought by him in Europe by the Confederate States Navy Department, viz., five steam cruisers, one sailing vessel, eight steam blockade-runners, one steamer for harbor defence, four steamers contracted for, but unfinished at the close of the war; total, fifteen furnished and four under construction. Nor was this all which was contributed; for, meagre as the means were from the beginning to the end of the war, there were continuous efforts to create and utilize all existing means for defence. To the Confederacy the world is indebted for the introduction of iron-clad ships. A vessel abandoned by the United States was shielded with railroad iron for the want of plates, and made a record at Hampton Roads which can never be forgotten.

I have just received (August 13) a letter from Captain Bullock, containing important testimony. Captain Bullock, as stated above, was appointed by me, when Provisional President, as the sole agent of the Confederate States in Europe for the purchase of arms, cruisers, transports, and naval munitions of war. He was appointed a captain of the Confederate States as soon as he resigned his commission in the United States Navy. His letter is as follows:

30 SYDENHAM AVENUE, SIFTON PARK, LIVERPOOL, July 29, 1889.

MY DEAR SIR: Mr. Stoess handed me your letter of the 15th instant this morning, and I hasten to reply by the first returning steamer. I have never seen the book to which you allude, namely, "The Military Operations of General G. T. Beauregard," but, in June, 1884, Mr. Charles K. Prioleau, who was then living in Bruges, sent me a copy of the Charleston *News and Courier* which contained a long, interesting, and very able review of the work.

The reviewer gave many extracts from the book, and among them one stating, in effect, that a fleet of steamers belonging to the East Indian Navy had been offered to the Confederate Government at the beginning of the war, and had been declined by them, and that the offer had been made by or through Mr. Charles K. Prioleau. Mr. Prioleau was the senior partner of the Liverpool firm of Fraser, Trenholm & Co., a firm affiliated with Messrs. John Fraser & Co., of Charleston, and the Liverpool branch held the position of the bankers and financial agents of the Confederate Government during the war of secession. Mr. Prioleau was then brought into close personal and official relations with me during the whole period of that war, and as he had never mentioned to me this alleged offer to the Confederate Government, nor had ever drawn my attention to any such ships, I was greatly surprised by the statement in the review of "General Beauregard's Military Operations." I wrote at once to Mr. Prioleau, asking him for information and requesting him, if there was any truth in the statement, to tell me why he never mentioned the matter to me. He wrote me a very long letter in reply, much of its contents being wholly irrelevant to the

point at issue, but I enclose herewith a paper marked A*, which is a verbatim copy of all that he wrote in respect to my specific inquiries about the alleged offer to the Confederate Government.

When I went to Richmond in October, 1861, to consult with Mr. Mallory about our naval operations in Europe, he dwelt much upon the wish of the government to get cruisers afloat, and also armored ships to break the blockade. It is not possible to believe that he would have omitted all allusion to the East Indian Company's fleet, if he had ever heard of those vessels. I had just then returned from England with the "Fingal," and, as before mentioned, Mr. Prioleau had given me not a hint of the alleged offer. After my return to Europe, I both heard of and saw some of the ships, but a glance satisfied me that to buy them for the Confederate Navy would have been a senseless waste of money. They were very big ships, drawing too much water to enter any Confederate port on the Atlantic coast. At the time I saw them they were wholly dismantled, and without guns or any military equipment. To arm and man them for the purpose of attacking the blockading ships would have required the resources of a well-furnished dock-yard, and the right to enlist seamen without interference. It would have been impossible to equip so large a naval force upon the high seas, or at some secret place of rendezvous, as was done with the "Alabama" and other cruisers. To put those ten ships in fighting condition would have required about one hundred heavy guns, and from twelve to fifteen hundred seamen, stokers, etc., with a large supply of small arms and ordnance stores. It would also have been necessary to have several large coal-transports to accompany the fleet, as the ships had only auxiliary sail power, and were dependent upon steam for motive power.

If Mr. Mallory had ever suggested the purchase of these ships, I should just have mentioned the foregoing facts, and have drawn his attention to the proclamation of Her Britannic Majesty, the British neutrality laws, and the restrictions in respect to

* A.

BRUGES, 21st June, 1884.

MY DEAR BULLOCK:

. . . As regards the ten steamers, I thought you knew about them. They were a part of the East India Company's fleet, the "Golden Fleece," "Jason," "Hydaspes," etc.; they were offered to me at the very beginning of the war, before you came over, and before the Queen's proclamation. My idea was that if they could have been armed and got out, they would have swept away every vestige of a Federal blockader then upon the water. Fraser, Trenholm & Co. had not then been appointed agents of the government, and I did not offer these vessels to the government, but I mentioned them in a private letter to Mr. G. A. Trenholm, leaving it to his discretion to put it before them.

As a matter of fact, I never got any reply to this letter and never knew that the ships had even been proposed to the government till long after the war. No further inquiries were ever made of me concerning them from any quarter. About nine or ten years (or perhaps not quite so much) ago, General Beauregard wrote me, saying that he was engaged upon his history, that he had heard about these steamers through William Trenholm, who had referred him to me for the particulars, and asked me if I would give him a statement, and allow him to mention my name as to my part of the transaction, to which I willingly consented and gave him just the facts stated above. Of course, I know *now* that the enterprise would have been impossible, but we did not know anything for certain then; and any opinion of mine would have been that of a layman and on its face valueless; therefore, when I heard no more I naturally concluded either that Mr. Trenholm had not thought it worth while to propose the undertaking, or that the government had been advised against it by their competent officers, and there is no doubt now that they were quite right not to risk so large a sum of money on so doubtful an enterprise, even if they could have readily raised it. It is, however, a little strange that, if the government knew of these ships at the time you left, they did not instruct you to look at them. On the whole, I am inclined to think that they were never offered to the government at all, but William Trenholm knew of them from having access to his father's correspondence. . . .

I am, ever yours sincerely,

C. K. PRIOLEAU.

the coaling of belligerent ships proclaimed by all the neutral powers, and he would have perceived the impracticability of such an undertaking. At a later period of the war Mr. Mallory did direct me to examine two vessels, which I have reason to believe belonged to the same fleet. On page 253, Vol. II., of "The Secret Service of the Confederate States," you will find my report with reference to them. I think at the moment of nothing else worth mentioning on the subject of your letter, but will be glad to give you any further information you may wish, if in my power to do so.

Very faithfully yours,
JAMES D. BULLOCK.

To Hon. JEFFERSON DAVIS.

In the face of facts like these, and many others to which the want of space does not permit me to refer, this self-constituted authority upon military affairs and civil government, ignorantly or maliciously—to me it matters not which—proceeds on an assumption which had no real foundation to characterize me as

III.—"*The ruler who could not see that the one vital necessity for the South was, at all sacrifice and at all hazard, to keep the ports open.*"

An Englishman of ordinary intelligence might be expected to know how vigilant his government was in preventing even unarmed merchantmen from leaving their ports, if any one would allege that they were intended to be converted into war-ships for the use of the Confederate States. The espionage to which Captain Bullock was subjected and the delays which resulted from forcing him to appeal to the courts must show how flippant and absurd it is to assert that a fleet of steamers might have been purchased, manned, and equipped, and sent out as cruisers to raise the blockade of Confederate ports. Captain Bullock, vigilant and active, inquiring as well in the ports of Great Britain as those of the Continent, seems never to have found this fleet of steamers so admirably adopted to war purposes that with them the Gulf and Atlantic seaboard might have been so cleanly swept that the commander of the fleet should have carried a broom at his masthead.

The next arraignment by Lord Wolseley's unbridled imagination is to describe me as

IV.—"*The ruler who rejected all means proposed by others for placing the finances of the Confederacy on a sound basis.*"

This is understood to be the long-ago-exploded theory that the Confederacy should have sent out the cotton crop of 1860–'61 and placed it as the basis of credit in Europe. In answer to this visionary charge against the administration as the cause of Confederate failure, Mr. C. G. Memminger, the Secretary of the Treas-

ury, on the 27th of March, 1874, wrote to the editor of the Charleston *News and Courier* a letter from which the following conclusive extracts are made :

"The Confederate Government was organized in February, 1861. The blockade was instituted in May, thus leaving a period of three months in which the whole cotton crop on hand, say 4,000,000 bales, ought, according to this military financier, to have been got into the hands of the Confederate Government and to have been shipped abroad. This would have required a fleet of four thousand ships, allowing one thousand bales to the ship! Where would these vessels have been procured in the face of the notification of the blockade? and was not as much of the cotton shipped by private enterprise as could have been shipped by the government? When so shipped, the proceeds of the sale were in most cases sold to the government in the shape of bills of exchange. The superior advantage of this plan is evinced by the fact that throughout the year the government exchanged its own notes for bills on England at par, with which it paid for all its arms and munitions of war. . . .

"C. G. MEMMINGER.

In answer to the same vague assertion, G. A. Trenholm, the successor of Mr. Memminger in the Treasury Department, wrote to the editor of the Charleston *News and Courier* a full answer, from which I make the following extract :

"Let us examine the facts upon which this theory rests, and without the support of which it must necessarily fall to the ground. The crop of cotton available for this scheme must have been that of 1860-'61. It could not have been the crop of which the seed was not yet put in the ground when the government was formed at Montgomery. What was, then, the crop of 1860-'61? Was it 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 bales, and was it accessible for immediate exportation? . . . Up to the 28th of February, the month that gave birth to the infant government, 3,000,000 bales had been received at the seaports, and the great bulk of it had been exported to Europe, or been sold to the New England spinners. By the 1st of May 586,000 bales more had been received and sold. England and the Continent took 3,127,000 bales; the New England spinners 654,000 bales. It will thus be seen that before the new government was fairly organized *the entire crop was already beyond its reach!* Another crop followed, but the exportation in any quantity was an absolute impossibility. There were no vessels in the ports of the Confederacy. The last had left before the expiration of the sixty days allowed to foreign tonnage. The only vessels that took cotton after that time were the foreign steamers that ran the blockade to procure cargoes for the owners. They came in small numbers, and one or two at a time. Had the government seized one of them for its own use or prevented them from leaving with cotton, they would have ceased to come.'

These extracts from the letters of two of the ablest financiers of the South, whose close relation to the Treasury Department gave them the best opportunity of knowing what could, should, or might have been done, will, it is hoped, be satisfactory to any who have doubted the propriety of the financial policy of the Confederacy, or who have not seen that the plan proposed was utterly impracticable.

JEFFERSON DAVIS.

THE OPEN DOOR OF QUACKERY.

BY DR. WILLIAM G. EGGLESTON, OF CHICAGO, DR. AUSTIN FLINT, PROFESSOR OF PHYSIOLOGY, AND DR. R. OGDEN DOREMUS, PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY, IN BELLEVUE HOSPITAL MEDICAL COLLEGE.

So far as I have been able to discover by extensive investigation, this country (the United States) is the only one in which a fraudulent medical college has ever existed; the only country in which the National Government exercises no control whatever over medical education—a matter of the most vital importance to the public; the only one in which several sections of the country have medical laws all of which are different; the only one in which the signatures of a few stock-holding professors in a medical college entitle the holder of a diploma to practise medicine; the only one in which the educational requirements for admission to and graduation from *legally incorporated* medical colleges vary from *nil* to very high; and the only country on earth in which the *extinct* medical colleges almost equal the number of extant ones—one hundred and five of the former and one hundred and seventeen of the latter, exclusive of preparatory schools.

Our National Government exercises no control whatever over a matter that directly affects the comfort, wealth, health, and lives of the people—medical education and medical practice. Of no other country that pretends to any civilization whatever can this be said. Not to mention the countries of higher civilization, those that we are accustomed to look upon as somewhat or very low down in the scale of modern civilization, such as Finland, Rumania, Spain, Guatemala, Mexico, Chili, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, Syria, Turkey, Japan, and Egypt, all exercise a direct control over medical education, medical practice, and the public health. The whole list of countries that exercise such control is thirty-one, the United Kingdom and its colonies being counted as one.

"But," some one says, "the cases are entirely different. In each of those countries there is practically but one government; in this country practically between three and four dozen. Medical education is not in the hands of our National Government, but must be regulated by the State governments. The National Government has no right to interfere in such matters." Here, then, we are confronted by the doctrine of State Sovereignty, a two-edged weapon, which cuts both ways at the whim of the person using it. While there is no clause in our Constitution granting to the Federal Government the supervision of educational matters, there is a "general welfare" clause, and I take it that education of the people and the health of the people come under any definition of the terms "general welfare of the people." And we have not always held the Constitution a sacred thing. One of its clauses or articles provides that no new State shall be made from a part of an already existing State except by consent of the people of the latter,—an article that has been violated in at least one instance.

What has been the outcome of leaving the regulation of medical education and practice in the hands of State legislatures? As regards medical education, the most that any State has done is to be seen in the recent Minnesota act, which provides for a definite term of study in all the colleges of the State, and appointed a Board of Medical Examiners, who are to examine all applicants for license to practise medicine, but who shall examine no candidate unless he be a graduate of a school requiring three full courses of medical study. This law, of course, reacts on colleges patronized by Minnesota students and on men intending to practise in that State. Some years ago the State of Illinois created a State Board of Health, and placed medical educational matters in its hands, with certain provisions. This board made a "schedule of minimum requirements," to which every college in the country must conform in order that its diplomas may be registrable in Illinois. Students from colleges that fall short of the requirements of the Illinois board must stand an examination before the board before the license is issued. Missouri has a board created under a law similar to that of Illinois. Indiana has a medical act unlike any of these. In Michigan medical education and practice are go-as-you-please matters, as is the case in Texas and several other States. Thus far it has been impossible to get a legis-

lature to pass any medical act in these States that would be of any service. In Virginia, North Carolina, and three or four other States, boards of medical examiners have been created by the legislatures. The diploma counts for nothing, and every candidate for license must stand an examination before the board. In Pennsylvania the medical act is unlike that of any other State, and remarkable chiefly for its inefficiency. There has been recently passed in New York a revised medical act, complicated and verbose to the last degree, and, like the medical acts of most of the other States, different from all the others. In short, at the present rate, if we had a thousand States in the Union, and each one had a medical act, we should have about eight hundred different medical acts in the country, and none for the District of Columbia.

How can we account for this great diversity of the State laws in the States that have attempted legislative interference with medical practice? It certainly is not due to the fact that the framers of the acts have had nothing to guide them. An examination of the medical acts of the thirty-one foreign countries will show that there is greater uniformity among them than among a smaller number of State medical acts in this country. It cannot be that the conditions of medical practice are different in the different States. The conditions of practice, outside of any legislative interference or regulation, are the same in the red spot on the map called Indiana as in the green spot called Ohio. But, just as every one thinks he can edit a newspaper, every doctor who thinks of the matter at all thinks he can frame a medical act that will be more perfect than any other act. When this is taken before a State legislature, each legislator thinks he can make an important amendment or change, and in order to secure his vote that must be made. The results are the acts that we have.

As I have said, there is a uniformity running through the medical laws of other countries. The chief points of uniformity are that each country begins at the foundation, and prescribes the amount of general education that a person must have before entering upon the study of medicine; each one prescribes the number of terms that must be spent in the colleges in the study of medicine; almost all prescribe the methods of study (in the sense that the courses must be graded); almost all prescribe the number of examinations that each student must stand and pass before he is

entitled to his degree; and almost all require the applicant for license to stand a state examination, the diploma not entitling the holder to practise. More than this, almost all prescribe that before the candidate can come up for the state examination he must have had a certain amount of hospital experience. Not one of our State medical acts or medical boards demands and prescribes all of these things. In the United States the longest course required by any board at present is three years of study in college. With the exception of Belgium, all foreign countries require from four to seven years, including compulsory hospital instruction.

One reason, I think, why the framers of our medical acts have not profited by the acts of foreign countries is the very prevalent idea that what is foreign is not good and whatever is American is the best in the world. By a process of careless thinking, and by the tiresome boasting of those that wish for popularity, we have come to think that our Republic is the largest on earth, and therefore the best; that all the conditions of existence and government in this country are antipodal to those of any and all other countries, and that everything in the shape of legislation and social regulation in a "free country" should be essentially different from what obtains in non-republican countries. I believe that our methods of thinking and reasoning in such things have been very injurious to the actual progress of this country.

Legislative regulation of medical education in this country has been spasmodic, diverse, and too frequently misdirected. The results may be seen by looking at the condition of our medical colleges. An honorable and very small minority have taken a firm stand for high medical education. The majority of them, however, being in the hands of private individuals, conducted for the money that can be made out of them, have done nothing in the way of raising our low standard of medical education except by compulsion of the few efficient State medical boards. There being enough medical colleges in this country to educate medical men for 300,000,000 people,—since we have but about one-fifth that number,—the competition is of the kind that kills. Complaisant legislatures have chartered unnecessary colleges, "professors" have invested money in them, and that money must be made to bear interest. In order to draw students, the standards for matriculation and graduation have been put down so low as to make an American diploma almost a reproach in other countries.

So long as there were no State boards to examine candidates for license to practise, or to reject diplomas from legalized diploma-mills, many of these institutions flourished, the stockholders being regardless of the rights of the public and recreant to the profession they ceased to honor. When the State boards were created, however, and began to do their duties, there went up a great cry from the large number of low-class medical colleges. Their students had been graduated, often with honors, only to be ignominiously plucked by a State board. Here was a state of things. Those graduates held pieces of parchment that had always in this country been the license to practise; now the State boards began to show that many of the colleges were graduating incompetent men. The Illinois board and the boards of North Carolina and Virginia especially have shown that some of the colleges that make great pretensions are but little better than diploma-mills. Yet, since but a very few of the States have any efficient medical acts and boards, the candidate rejected in one State has only to go to a State in which there is no board to pry into his ignorance and unfitness for practice, and there prey upon the confiding and unprotected people.

Still another result of non-regulation of the colleges and medical education has been to overstock the country with doctors. For every doctor in the country necessary to perform the functions and work of a practitioner, there are two unnecessary ones, and the percentage of unnecessary doctors is increasing, though not at the same rate as before the few efficient State boards began their work.

In the opening paragraph of this paper I spoke of the fraudulent medical colleges of this country. As I said, I can find no record of the existence of fraudulent colleges—colleges that exist solely for the purpose of selling diplomas—in any other country. The whole number of these that have been exposed and broken up is, I think, more than a dozen, and the majority of them owe their exposure to Dr. John H. Rauch, secretary of the Illinois State Board of Health. It does seem singular that an officer of the State of Illinois should have to interest himself directly to expose and break up fraudulent colleges in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and other States; but such has been the case. So long as there were no State boards to inquire into the diplomas of persons wishing to practise medicine, or to examine such persons, these fraud-

ulent schools had but little, if anything, to fear. A diploma carried with it the right to practise, and, so far as the people knew, one diploma did not differ from another. It is estimated on tolerably reliable data that there are in this country about 10,000 men practising medicine upon the diplomas of one of these fraudulent schools, and it is known that some of these men never studied medicine for ten minutes. One of these schools, the Bellevue Medical College, Boston, Mass., sent a diploma C.O.D. to a young journalist of Springfield, Ill., upon his writing the following thesis, at the instigation of Dr. Rauch:

VACINATION.*

THE Grate increase of Disease in thease Late years Calls for Explanation Undoubtedly the Doctors of this day is to blame for very much of it But more than anything Else in my opinion is the Inseartion into the Pure Blood and Vitle fluid of our Inosent offspring of that vile Diseas of the Animals cowpox So grate has the Curse Became that Privelidges of School Edication is Denide in this and Many other States to those who wisely Refuse to Submit to this Curse that is just a Peace of the Nonsensikal Medical teachings of the Day when Theory and Imagination Rool Instead of Practical Expearance and which keaps its Studends in close Confinement a Big part of three or four years to hear the Nonsens which is thear peddeld out to them consumtion Siffles and Skin Disease Runn Wild among the People This calls for a Strong kick on the Part of our noble Proffession which should seak to Build upp the Health and Streangth of the People instedd of Planting the Seeds of Diseas in them To Prove that Vacination Dont do no good we nead ondly to say that Thear has Been More Small Pox in this Place in the last year than thear was in the last Nineteen or Twenty year and more deaths from it I neadnt say no more About a Thing that is so Plane to Eny thinking man or Woman Eather we should all Band ourselves togather in all Parts of the Country to Shut off this Cursed Practiss the people Should be tought Better But the Days is Cuming when Enlightenment will take the Place of Ignoranse and Prejudice and when that Time Comes these fannatics who live by Scaring People will have to step aside and Vacination will not be Heard of any more.

BY V B KELLY.

"Comment on the foregoing," says Dr. Rauch, "would be entirely superfluous, were it not that this travesty on much that goes for Medical Education in the United States is so ludicrous as to mask the satire it contains. It would not be difficult to parallel the tenor of the Third Year's Announcement of the Massachusetts Bellevue with announcements of older institutions not chartered as 'manufacturing corporations.' Nor is the mode of making out the necessary time 'spent in the study of medicine' entirely unfamiliar to many colleges which claim to be in good standing, and which, unfortunately, are accepted as such. How many ignoramuses with not one whit more of education, either literary or medical, than is displayed in the essay on 'Vacina-

* The president of the school was a rabid anti-vaccinationist.

tion,' are every year turned loose upon the public, each bearing a 'diploma' reciting that some particular Rufus King Noyes and his colleagues have adjudged and decreed the bearer (in the sonorous Latin of the Bellevue sheepskin, price $150, C.O.D.) *hominem egregium studiis optimus deditum*—a distinguished man devoted to the noblest pursuits—*dignum atque idoneum qui honoretur altissimo dignitatus gradu*—worthy and fit to be honored with the highest mark of distinction. Having sufficiently investigated (as to his scientific and scholarly attainments)—*satis compertum exploratumque habemus*—as witness the thesis on 'Vacination,' we, to wit: Rufus King Noyes, with one consent—*uno animo*—have created and made—*creavimus et fecimus eum Doctorem Medicinæ*—literally 'manufactured' him into a doctor!"*

It is scarcely necessary to say that most of the extinct medical schools (the number of which is one hundred and five as against one hundred and seventeen existing American schools) never had any good excuse for being in existence. With not more than four exceptions, the medical profession and the people of the country would be better off had these schools never been founded. The very fact that they have passed out of existence in a country in which the lowest grade of medical schools can exist, most of them being of that class, is sufficient to show that there was no good reason for their being brought into existence. We have more of these extinct schools than all other countries combined.

While we have one hundred and seventeen medical schools

*The charter of this Bellevue College of Boston was repealed in 1883. Its first officers, on the trial which resulted from the exposure, pleaded that they were legally incorporated, and were empowered by the laws of Massachusetts to issue diplomas and confer degrees without any restriction as to course of study or professional attainments. The United States Commissioner, before whom the trial was had, held the plea to be valid, and dismissed the case with the following remarks: "The State has authorized this college to issue degrees, and it has been done according to legal right. . . . The law makes the faculty of the college the sole judges of eligibility of applicants for diplomas. There is no legal restriction, no legal requirements. *If the faculty choose to issue degrees to incompetent persons, the laws of Massachusetts authorize it.*" As a result of this decision, the "American University of Boston," and the "First Medical College of the American Health Society," were incorporated under the same authority as the "Bellevue"; and the "Excelsior Medical College" and others were projected. The passage (June 30, 1883) of an act forbidding any corporation, organized under the public statutes above referred to, from conferring medical degrees or issuing diplomas, or certificates conferring or purporting to confer degrees, unless specially authorized by the Legislature so to do, deprived these concerns of the only object of their creation, namely, the sale of fraudulent diplomas.—*Illinois State Board Report.*

that grant degrees, there are less than two hundred medical schools outside of the United States. Taking the average of all other countries as a fair average, we have, as I have said, schools enough in this country to educate medical men for 300,000,000 people. Were these schools of a high class, and doing good work, no one could object to their continuing in existence. It is only a small minority, however, that do even tolerable work. To determine this, we must take the statistics of a State Board of Medical Examiners in a State in which all applicants for license are examined. The last report of the Virginia Board of Medical Examiners (April 20, 1888) shows that two hundred and twelve candidates have come before that board since January, 1885, and fifty-four, or a little more than 23 per cent., failed. These candidates came from twenty-six colleges of this country. The candidates from thirteen colleges all passed; while the other thirteen colleges sent one hundred and fifty-six candidates (graduates), and an average of more than one-third was rejected from each college. Now apply these figures to the more than thirty-six thousand graduates of American colleges from 1877 to 1887, and see how many men are practising medicine that would have been rejected by the Virginia board—more than eight thousand!

But however good medical-practice acts and boards Virginia and Illinois and North Carolina may have, and however many applicants for licenses to practise they may reject, there are States adjoining these that are unprotected, and into these and the other unprotected States the incompetent and rejected graduates go. The Illinois, North Carolina, Minnesota, and Virginia boards not only reject incompetent men, but the very fact of the existence of these boards deters a large number of consciously-incompetent men from applying for license in those States. Consequently the States that have no medical acts and boards that amount to anything suffer all the more.

As a matter of fact, however, such acts and boards as I have mentioned have frightened many of the low-class colleges into doing better work. And should every State have an efficient board, we would soon see a practical example of survival of the fittest, and death of the low-grade colleges. Of course, the low-grade colleges will be heard from on the subject of boards of medical examiners. In fact, one in Virginia has been heard from already. This college was in favor of the Virginia board

until it began to be shown by the examinations of the board that it was graduating incompetent men. Then there was a terrible wail from the college (the Medical College of Virginia) and from its students, and the State Legislature was beset to exempt the students of this college from the examinations—a practical acknowledgement that the college was doing bad work. Fortunately, however, the Legislature did not see why the students of this college should be exempt from examinations. When boards of examiners are created in other States, other colleges will be heard from. They must either do better work or become extinct, and the sooner they mend their ways the more chance have they of surviving.

There are not a dozen American medical colleges out of the one hundred and seventeen that would be tolerated for a moment in any foreign country that pretends to be civilized. And while, on account of some of our dead and living eminent medical men, the profession of America is respected in other countries, American diplomas, as a class, are a byword and almost a reproach among the profession in foreign countries. And thus will they continue to be until medical education and practice are regulated throughout the country. For years the representative men of the profession have been before the State legislatures and asked for such regulation. All the legislation that exists has been obtained by persistent effort on the part of the medical profession. On the one side have been the better class of medical men; on the other side the quacks, charlatans, low-class colleges, and some newspaper men who are "agin the doctors" because they do not advertise in the newspapers.

In the matter of medical legislation the States have failed in their duty. The indications are that they will continue to fail in this respect. To protect the health and lives of the people is the plain duty of any and every government. To get the best results, and to insure uniformity of regulations, the whole matter should be placed in the hands of the Federal Government. Why should we lag in the rear of all other nations?

WILLIAM G. EGGLESTON.

IT IS not putting the statement too strongly to say that in the United States the door is open to quackery wider than in any other civilized country. As we, as a nation, become older, our people are more and more efficiently protected against public dan-

gers of various kinds, such as the unrestricted sale of poisons, the erection of unsanitary and unsafe buildings, and the many acts of violence that occur in newly-settled regions. It is time, at last, for the medical profession to make a united effort to protect the people against quackery; for the disjointed, spasmodic, and crude attempts that have been made in this direction have resulted in but little good except in a few States. Every physician knows that absolute protection is impossible. Many unfortunates, afflicted with incurable or tedious chronic diseases, grasp at anything that offers a hope of relief, whether it be a remedy recommended by a sympathizing friend or a cure advertised in the secular press. Unhappily, the demand for panaceas and for the services of those who claim to cure by extraordinary means is not confined to those who are deficient in intelligence or weakened and discouraged by exhausting diseases. So long as the love of the marvellous exists, so long will there be a certain demand for quackery, and the supply will not entirely fail.

Dr. Eggleston's article is most timely; but while it demonstrates clearly enough the magnitude of the evil of quackery, it presents no definite plan of relief. Such a plan should emanate from the medical profession. Of course, the ideal remedy is in the intelligent regulation of the practice of medicine by the general government; but I shall dismiss this with the statement that, in my opinion, it is impossible. Nearly the same result, however, would follow if concerted and uniform action could be taken simultaneously by all the States.

It is difficult to accomplish much good so long as a serious antagonism exists between the colleges and any respectable part of the general profession; but I think that whatever antagonism exists can be harmonized upon a basis of well-considered and judicious legislation. The influential colleges must cöoperate with the profession at large, or failure is probable. An experience of more than thirty years in medical teaching, and much thought devoted to the questions considered by Dr. Eggleston, have led me to certain definite ideas concerning practical and practicable measures for the elevation of the standard of acquirement in the medical profession by legislation. It seems to me that if a comprehensive act were passed in the State of New York, which would evidently accomplish the ends so much to be desired, but little effort would be required to secure the adoption of similar acts in other States,

and that practical uniformity of law in all the States of the Union would be the final result. I shall first outline what, it seems to me, would be a proper act, and afterward give my reasons for certain of its provisions.

I. The regents of the University of the State of New York to appoint a board of medical examiners, to consist of fourteen members, seven to be nominated by the unsectarian medical colleges empowered to confer the degree of M. D. in the State of New York, and to be teachers in said colleges, and seven to be nominated by the unsectarian State medical societies; the board to be so constituted that there shall be two examiners for each of the seven subjects of practice of medicine, surgery, obstetrics, materia medica and therapeutics, physiology, anatomy, chemistry, and the collateral branches.

II. After a certain date, no person to be permitted to practise medicine who has not received a license from the board of examiners, with the following exceptions:

(a) Physicians registered up to the date mentioned.

(b) Physicians from other States and from foreign countries who hold licenses from boards of examiners the requirements of which are in no degree less than those of the board of examiners of the State of New York; such licenses to be examined and endorsed by one of the medical colleges of the State of New York and certified to as meeting the requirements of the board of medical examiners.

III. The board of examiners to recognize, in their examinations, but one science of medicine; but no candidate to be rejected by reason of his adherence to any sectarian system, such as homœopathy, provided he pass the regular examination of the board.

IV. A candidate to be eligible to appear for examination before the board, if he produce a diploma from an incorporated medical college of the State of New York or from a recognized medical college not in the State of New York, the requirements of which were in no degree less than those of the medical colleges of the State of New York at the time the diploma was issued.

V. The votes on candidates to be by the seven subjects before enumerated, and two adverse votes of the seven to reject a candidate; provided that no candidate shall be licensed who receives an adverse vote in either one of the subjects of practice of medicine, surgery, or obstetrics.

VI. A candidate who has been rejected not to be eligible for reëxamination until at least six months have elapsed since his rejection; but the reëxamination, at the discretion of the board, may be upon those subjects only in which he has failed to pass on his previous examinations.

VII. In voting on candidates, no vote on any subject to be accepted as affirmative unless both examiners on that subject shall agree. In case of disagreement, the vote to be regarded as adverse; provided that when but one examiner is present at the examination he may cast an affirmative or a negative vote, and that, when neither examiner is present, another member of the board may be assigned to examine, and his vote shall be received.

VIII. The board to have the power to revoke the license of any physician for certain causes, such as conviction of crime, grossly unprofessional conduct, etc.

After a certain date, the following to be the requirements of the medical colleges in the State of New York:

1. A matriculation examination, made within the first thirty days of the regular session or before, for those who have not a degree of A.B., B.S. or Ph.D., provided that equivalent matriculation examinations from other recognized colleges may be accepted.

2. An obligatory three-years' course, each course to be of not less than twenty-two weeks' duration, and no two courses to be taken within a single year.

3. At least two courses of dissections.

4. At least one course of laboratory work in chemistry.

5. At least one practical course in normal and pathological histology.

6. At least one clinical course each, with practical exercises, on practice of medicine, surgery, and gynæcology, of not less than twenty-two weeks' duration.

7. Colleges to make, yearly, complete and detailed reports to the regents of the University.

8. If it shall appear at any time that the provisions of the law with regard to medical colleges have been wilfully violated, it shall be the duty of the regents to recommend to the Legislature that the charter of the offending college be revoked.

In my opinion, it would be possible, if the unsectarian colleges of the State of New York would meet in convention, to frame a

comprehensive bill which would be satisfactory to the profession and would measurably protect the people against professional incompetence and quackery. If such a bill should be endorsed by the State medical societies and introduced under the auspices of the regents of the University, it would probably be passed.

There are certain points in the constitution of the board of examiners which I think the profession should insist upon. In no examining boards abroad is there a recognition of any sect in medicine. While it may be wise to provide that no candidate for a license shall be rejected by reason of any peculiar views which he may adopt, there is but one science of medicine. A so-called regular physician has the largest latitude of opinion, and he continues to rank as a regular physician so long as he adopts no sectarian designation. No man should be licensed to practise before he has shown by examination a certain proficiency in medicine. It remains with himself afterward either to adopt any designation, to advertise or employ any of the methods of the charlatan, or to practise simply as a physician. It is worse than absurd to exclude from examining boards professors in medical colleges. No one with any considerable experience in teaching and examining can fail to know that the most competent examiners are teachers. In a science the progress of which is so rapid, the chances are that those most likely to be fully informed with regard to recent advances which students should be expected to know, are teachers ; and it is a gratuitous insult to professors in medical colleges to assume that they would be likely to act unfairly in examinations. It is proper, however, that, in functions so important, the general profession should be represented, as in having the examinations conducted jointly by two persons in each subject, one of these not being a professor.

The same argument may be applied to the requirement that candidates shall already have passed an examination and been graduated by a medical college. This would certainly secure a higher grade of attainment than if candidates were examined by the medical board only. The requirement of a certain number of years of instruction is also essential. The medical department of the University of Virginia will graduate students after only nine months of study. I think it may be safely assumed that no student can be properly educated in medicine within that time. Under the existing conditions in this country, three years of

medical study seem to be sufficient. Students here do more work and less play than abroad; the teaching and drilling in the schools are more efficient; and, finally, the report of the president of Harvard University on the optional four-years' course in the medical school does not show that students who have taken that course are better educated than those who have been graduated in three years. Study after graduation and not with direct bearing upon examinations seems to produce better results in most instances than a lengthened course before graduation.

One of the most desirable and at the same time difficult things to secure is tolerably uniform legislation in the different States. A reciprocity of action will do much to promote this object, and, with this in view, a recognition of licenses issued by examining boards of other States, the requirements of which are not less stringent than those of the New York board, should be provided for. Foreign credentials, also, from boards fully equal in their requirements to the New York board, should be recognized. The examination and endorsement of such documents could be best and most conveniently done by the colleges.

I fully agree with Dr. Eggleston that there are very few medical colleges in the United States in which the teaching is so thorough and efficient as it is in Great Britain, France, or Germany; still there are some in which the instruction is, in certain regards, even superior to what is found abroad. Many of the smaller colleges, however, are absolutely beneath contempt, and their inefficiency is simply disgraceful, while, at the same time, they publish in their circulars the most elaborate and high-sounding methods and requirements. The four medical colleges in Washington hold their lectures in the evening for the convenience of students who are at work in the departments during the day. Were certain colleges to form an association and refuse to recognize the tickets and diplomas of those institutions which do not come up to a proper standard of efficiency, most of these disreputable organizations would soon cease to exist.

AUSTIN FLINT.

IT IS undoubtedly true that a large number of students of medicine in Europe have received advantages in preliminary education superior to students in the United States. But we must

not forget that many of our graduates have enjoyed the privileges of a classical curriculum prior to undertaking their medical studies. Some prefix A.B. or A.M. to their M.D. Many more might do so, but wish to avoid appearing pedantic. Through competitive examinations they succeed in securing positions in our hospitals, and, after a thorough training, avail themselves of foreign travel and European climes, or study under some specialists, while others take a second degree abroad.

Even our best-informed citizens are probably not aware of the fact that in our municipal colleges there are hundreds of physicians who take *ad-eundem* degrees after having been engaged in practice for several years. This is a demonstration of their zeal for knowledge and of the rapid advancement of medical science. They not only attend the lectures and clinics, but respond to questions in their class "quizzes," like the undergraduates, and submit to as rigid final examinations. Of what other profession can this be said?

The late Dr. John Whittaker, renowned for his skill in drilling medical students, and subsequently a successful professor of anatomy in this city, informed me that when he came to this country he was surprised at the greater aptitude of American students for acquiring knowledge over those he had instructed in Great Britain, where he graduated and taught for many years. Our students "meant business"; the limited means of most of them restrained them from wasting valuable time in frivolity or idleness. Our young men, in every department of life, whether professional or of a business character, assume responsibilities at an earlier age than those in Europe. Fifty years ago classical colleges received students at the age of fourteen. Now the preliminary training requires several additional years.

As a consequence of the peculiar application in our land of the old adage "*Ars longa, vita brevis*," we omit in our medical courses themes of minor value and substitute those of more vital importance to the medical practitioner. Of course, all knowledge is of service in developing the intellectual faculties, broadening the range of thought, and producing a more matured man. While it is essential for a doctor to know something of the Latin and Greek languages to comprehend medical nomenclature and write prescriptions, yet I doubt the wisdom of the old system, where a boy commenced the study of Latin at

eight years of age, of Greek at nine, and continued said studies through his collegiate course, devoting a goodly part of ten years to the classics, to the exclusion of the modern languages, which he should be able to read with facility (if not to speak them fluently) in order to place German, French, and Italian journals and scientific books at his command. Centuries past, learned men employed the Latin language as the vehicle of their thoughts, and all aspirants for knowledge in medicine, law, or religion had to be classical scholars. But a new era has arisen. The *living* languages are more in demand than the *dead* ones.

For the average medical man the higher branches of mathematics, such as conic sections, the calculus, etc., have little value, excepting as a means for developing certain brain powers. The Almighty has permitted us to solve many of the problems hidden to our ancestors. The rapidly-developing themes of chemistry and physics demand the attention of the medical student. Some of the old practitioners decry these studies.

The mystery of animal heat has been revealed, and although in regard to the nervous system we might in former times have written over the human body, as on the old charts of Africa, "*unknown regions,*" yet the physicist and chemist have undertaken the exploration. This is the age of thermometers, lenses, prisms, and electric instruments. We may well adopt as a motto the Scriptural expression, "There is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, neither hid that shall not be known." Medical schools are now demanding not only a general knowledge of these important sciences, but a practical laboratorial skill in handling test-tubes, retorts, chemical apparatus, and physical instruments of research.

A learned member of the bar, while looking at a class in the chemical laboratory, remarked: "When I attended Yale College I used to see the *professor* work miracles; here I see the *students* work miracles."

While many decry our American methods of instructing medical classes, allow me to narrate an incident. In the fall of 1862 I was invited by the late distinguished physiologist, Charles Robin, to be present at the opening of l'École de Médecine in Paris. He said the Emperor deemed that the French medical course was less complete than that in the schools of Germany and Austria. He had permitted

Paul Du Bois, the *secrétaire perpetuel,* to resign, and had appointed Rayer and himself to fill important chairs. But as he had not respected certain ancient customs in said appointments, Professor Robin feared the medical students would create a disturbance. I accepted the invitation and witnessed most disgraceful scenes. Several hundred medical students were arrested by the police for their attempt to prevent this much-needed reformation in medical instruction.

Professor Wurtz subsequently honored me with an invitation to be present, or, as the French term it, to "assist" at his opening chemical lecture. Prior to entering the amphitheatre, I asked where he instructed the medical classes in analytical chemistry. He replied that he had no laboratory for this purpose. I narrated to him the custom and conveniences in the American schools of medicine, where I had occupied the chair of chemistry. In the New York Medical College, opened in 1850, besides providing the apparatus for lecture illustrations, we arranged a students' chemical laboratory (the first established in a medical college in the United States), and gave them instruction in the analyses of poisons, urine, calculi, milk, etc. At the Long Island Hospital Medical College, founded in 1860, a students' laboratory was likewise provided for this practical work, as also at the New York Bellevue Hospital Medical College. Besides an oral or written examination in chemistry, all candidates for graduation had to exhibit their skill in the analyses of such substances as were of importance to the physician in his practice.

One of the late chancellors of a renowned German university remarked to a medical teacher, not long since, that the severest trial of his life was the examination of medical students in chemistry. Another German ex-chancellor, also a distinguished chemist, said to the same inquirer: "If the medical students could only remember so simple a fact as that Epsom salt is the sulphate of magnesia, it would afford me satisfaction"!

Since 1843 I have been connected with medical colleges as student, assistant in chemistry, and, later, as professor in this department, and I know that the faculties of medical colleges have always been attacked by certain of the profession for the incompleteness of the courses of instruction; and yet when said instructors have enlarged and increased the curriculum of study, they have keenly felt a lack of support from practitioners. For on

their advice office students mainly depend in their selection of the college in which they shall study and hope for a successful graduation. Ten years ago one of the New York medical colleges endeavored to establish a three-years' graded course. The other colleges did not offer to coöperate. They dared not make the venture. Hence it was expected that the number of students would be diminished for several years, as many of them would avail themselves of the other medical colleges in New York City and Philadelphia where the shorter course existed. But the countenance, sympathy, and support of the profession were unwisely relied on to aid in this advance movement. After a fair trial, the Utopian scheme had to be abandoned, or the college would have been broken up. If at that time a State law had existed obliging all its medical schools to give a three-years' graded course of study, it would have but partially met the case; for in States not remote were venerable medical colleges in which only two years' attendance at the lectures and three years of study were required of the candidates for graduation. Here action by the National Government would have effectually accomplished the desired result.

The lengthened course is more serious to students in rural districts or from a distance than to city students. It involves the expense of a third year's residence away from their homes, and also the cost of travel. Otherwise it is greatly to the advantage of teachers and their pupils. It relieves both from over-exertion. Now, every hour and half-hour of the student's time is occupied from morn till midnight with lectures, clinics, dissections, quizzes, attendance at the hospitals, and special studies. On one occasion, at the close of the laboratorial drill, I suggested to the faithful workers to take a dozen test-tubes and chemicals to their rooms and familiarize themselves with the reactions. One of them exclaimed, "But we haven't time to eat!"—a remark that was echoed by such a chorus of laughter as indicated how fully the rest of the class agreed with the sentiment of the audacious spokesman.

In most of the European colleges the professors are paid by the governments. Many have residences provided for them, or an equivalent allowance; also apparatus, laboratories, and remunerated assistants. Professors' fees are higher there than in this country. They have also subsidiary emoluments. Dumas was

made senator; so also Berthelot and Naquet, for which they received, under the Empire, 100,000 francs. After thirty years of service, if they have reached the age of threescore, the French government provides a pension. Professors Helmholtz and Du Bois Reymond divide a large and elegant structure, at least three hundred feet square, with domiciles for themselves and their assistants; two large lecture-rooms and extensive suites of private laboratories; also laboratories for students, and museums filled with costly apparatus. There are similar provisions for Von Hofmann, Ludwig, and all renowned German professors. The veteran teacher, Frederick Wöhler, when he built his laboratory at Göttingen, returned 30,000 thalers to the Hanoverian government, claiming that it was in excess of the requiremeuts.

As a rule, professors in nearly all our colleges have meagre remuneration for their faithful labors. Their widows and fatherless daughters are often left to support themselves by teaching or keeping boarding-houses ; while the widows of French and German professors are pensioned. The late Professor Arnold Guyot, after a few years' residence in Cambridge, Mass., said to me that "money given during the life-time or after the demise of the donor for educational purposes is generally appropriated for erecting edifices, instead of founding chairs. Unless there is a change our educators must be celibates."

I was presented with one of the large copper induction coils of the late Professor Joseph Henry, with which he discovered the *induced* galvanic current, while professor of physics in Princeton College, and which he paid for from his meagre salary.* Faraday followed Henry in the development of this grand electrical law, without a knowledge of which the alternating system of lighting by electricity and telegraphing from a moving train would be impossible, without entering into other extensive fields involving his discovery.

I have urged several of our liberal-hearted citizens to consider that the reputation of an educational institution depended on the attainments of its professors and their talents in imparting their knowledge, holding their classes, and instilling zeal in their pupils, rather than in ornamental structures ; that their money

* This is but one of the many instruments which taxed his bank account in his vitally important original researches.

should be converted into developed *brains* rather than decorated *buildings*.

Some years since, after a dinner at Governor Tilden's, Professor Morse quoted the popular expression that "Americans worship the almighty dollar." He added: "This is not my belief; on the contrary, in no part of the world are private fortunes more lavishly appropriated for noble purposes than in this country. The man to whom I at one time paid laborer's wages for digging holes in the ground and planting telegraph-poles, has given half a million dollars to found Cornell University!" The names of many other large-hearted Americans were mentioned who had made princely donations for educational purposes. Of late there has been a *crescendo* movement in this direction: even millions are freely given. Through the liberality of Mr. Andrew Carnegie, not only was a pathological laboratory, which bears his name, erected for the Bellevue Hospital Medical College, but at the close of each session he has generously sent his check to cover its expenses.

The expensive apparatus for illustrating lectures in chemistry, physics, physiology, etc., in medical colleges is, as a rule, the property of the individual professors in these branches. The instruments have to be repaired, and constant additions must be made thereto, to keep pace with the advance in these sciences. The professors of practice of medicine, surgery, and obstetrics must command positions in hospitals. For these they rarely receive any salaries. They must also devote much unremunerated time to the sick poor. The late eminent surgeon and physician, Dr. James R. Wood, in the course of his long and useful career in this city, had on his books the names of over one hundred and ten thousand patients that he had treated gratuitously in his office. He also served for more than thirty years as one of the surgeons in the Bellevue Hospital, without a dollar's compensation. How many clergymen or lawyers can exhibit such a record of unrequited labor?

We need more Carnegies and Vanderbilts to enrich our *medical* colleges, endow our professorships, enlarge our laboratories, enhance our facilities for original research, and enliven zeal among our gifted students. Rather than severe criticism, the instructors in our reputable medical colleges deserve commendation from their professional brethren and the general public for

their arduous, self-sacrificing, and ill-requited labors. They will hail with delight any legislation tending to elevate their noble calling.

Many advocate the elimination of professors from examining boards. This will not raise the standard of medical instruction. How many eminent medical practitioners who are not teachers could thoroughly examine graduates of colleges in anatomy, materia medica, physiology, chemistry, physics, pathology, and bacteriology ? Professed instructors in these latter themes have to devote much of their time to keeping pace with these rapidly-advancing sciences as applied to medicine. No active practitioner can do it. The educated students would know more than their examiners. How many of the celebrated physicians and surgeons, unless recently graduated, have handled the spectroscope or the polariscope ? How many of them can make *quantitative* analyses of the urine, or determine the amounts of free ammonia, albuminoid ammonia, the chlorides, nitrates, and nitrites in water, to decide upon its potable character ? Yet the medical student of to-day has to familiarize himself with these themes. He is a much harder worker than his predecessors were.

As an illustration of the composition of an examining board, in 1871 the Legislature of this State passed a law authorizing the Mayor of New York to appoint a commission of four examiners of druggists and prescription clerks in this city. Two of the appointees were skilled druggists; one of them was vice-president of the New York College of Pharmacy. The examiner in Latin and the writing of prescriptions was a physician and professor of Latin in the Manhattan College (where his students had to be taught to speak in this language, to prepare them for the priesthood). The president of the commission, who examined in chemistry, had ten years' experience as professor in the College of Pharmacy. We examined over nine hundred druggists and prescription clerks the first year. At the instigation of the wholesale druggists the law was revoked. When medical men and the public needed protection against the importation of adulterated drugs, the National Government had to be appealed to. A law was passed appointing drug-examiners at every port of entry.

If we are to demand of all matriculants in medical schools diplomas from reputable classical and scientific colleges, or, in lieu

thereof, to pass a preliminary examination (as is now required through a recent act of the New York Legislature), and also that they attend graded medical courses of three years prior to becoming candidates for graduation, an act of the Federal Government could accomplish it. By the same authority boards of medical examiners could be appointed in the various States. But as each State claims the right to authorize the establishment of its universities and colleges, ought not the States to appoint their own examining boards? True, these boards would differ in rigidness. But this would also apply to examiners authorized at Washington.

All our best medical colleges adopt their own modes of examination. Some examinations are conducted privately by each professor, while others are public. At the New York Medical College the students were examined in the presence of the whole faculty and a board of censors, consisting of three eminent practitioners appointed by the board of trustees. At one period we invited the censors appointed by the State Medical Society, which the other New York Medical Colleges did not do. This was a severe ordeal for the candidates. But few of them could respond as successfully as if the examination had been less public.

Our National Government does not interfere in the education of those preparing for the bar or the pulpit. These professions are equally important for the "general welfare of the people" with that of medicine.

The "quack," the "shyster," and the "sheep in wolf's clothing" will always exist. Some men of business, railroad and mining officials, will exhibit the frailties of humanity. Fraudulent bills and coins will ever be found in circulation.

Both professional and non-professional men have seen great progress in all branches of education, and the medical portion has not proved an exception. We may predict that in a few years each State will have its board of medical examiners, and a unification of the entire system of such boards will probably follow without action of the Federal Government.

R. Ogden Doremus.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

EUROPE IN PERSIAN EYES.

AMERICANS are often amazed at what appears to be almost a deliberate intention on the part of intelligent Europeans to miss of a correct apprehension of the conditions of life in the United States. But on reflection we shall see that this proceeds from the natural difficulty most minds encounter in appreciating what is novel and outside of their experience, and hence jumping to the conclusion that because novel it must be objectionable. In most cases prejudice, rather than a disposition to decide unjustly, is the real cause of such ill-founded assumptions.

If such be the difficulty as between two regions having so much really in common as Western Europe and the United States, how infinitely more arduous must be the problem when Europe and Asia undertake to comprehend each other, and mete out full justice each to each. The numerous works of travel on the East, and the many estimates of Oriental character formed in different ages by Europeans, indicate, perhaps, in several instances keen observation of external facts and vivid pictures of the surface of Oriental life. But very, very few of them show ability on the part of the writer to abandon his own native prepossessions, and to judge of the qualities of the Asiatic mind with fairness or with any clear perception of its essential traits, or of the causes that moulded it and continue to keep its original cast unchanged, while the rest of the world moves on to higher planes of at least material progress.

The recent visit of Nasr-ed-Deen Shah to Europe suggests the natural inquiry as to whether an intelligent Asiatic, after surveying the pomp and splendor of the capitals of Europe and the so-called triumphs of modern science and of Western civilization, would confess to a sense of the inferiority of his own people and country, or, like the European judging of Asiatics, continue to regard Europeans as inferior beings. From what I have seen of Orientals of all ranks and degrees of intelligence, it seems to me altogether improbable that the contrast between European and Asiatic civilization would produce on the mind of an Oriental any impression arousing lasting respect and admiration or working any immediate and decided change in his character. Notwithstanding the wonder caused by the sight of the astonishing inventions of Europe or his occasional inclination to introduce some of them into his own country, the belief of the Asiatic in the superior genius and nobler character of his own people and their institutions will remain unshaken. The pageants of Europe will be to him merely as the amusement one takes in the tricks of a mountebank, which entertain the eye without in any sense affecting the serious side of the beholder's mind. He will return to his own country altogether satisfied that he is not like these misbegotten sons of unbelievers who eat the flesh of the unclean animal and expose the faces of their women in public.

While some such language might very likely be used by an Oriental when expressing his private opinion on this subject, it would be taking a very superficial view of the causes underlying such an opinion to assume that it proceeds from the national vanity of a shallow nature, or from a stolidity that is blind to the march of progress. The reason lies far deeper, and because Europeans have failed to perceive it they have almost uniformly failed to do justice to life and character in the East.

The differences existing between Frenchman and American, Englishman and Spaniard, are trifling compared with the deep gulf that lies between the Asiatic and the European character. We know nothing to which to compare it except the division of the human race into two great nations—one of men, the other of women. The temperamental differences between these sex nations, common to each the world over, are far more pronounced and ineradicable than the race divergence of German from Italian, Hindoo from Persian. In like manner we may classify the greater part of the human race under two vast divisions—the Asiatic and the European. No one Asiatic differs from another to any such degree as both differ from all Europeans.

The Asiatic mind looks at existence from a point of view entirely distinct from that of the European. Its grasp of facts, its method of logic or reasoning, is altogether and radically different. It has essentially a feminine cast,—a statement made in no invidious sense, for woman is not inferior to man, but only different. With great astuteness in certain directions the Asiatic combines a simplicity in other lines of thought akin to the innocence of childhood, both of these qualities prevailing even in the most brilliant Oriental to a degree impossible in a European of equal intelligence. Hence a European is liable to assume, when he encounters this phenomenal Asiatic simplicity, that he is talking with individuals of exceptional ignorance or crassness, when the reverse is more likely to be the case. The Asiatic mind concerns itself but little with facts, and hence is but moderately interested in scientific discovery, and prefers hyperbole and poetic forms of statement to a precise narrative of events. The Shah-Namêh of Firdoüsee is sufficient for the historic needs of most Persians. What inventions may be credited to the Orient have been wrung from it by stern necessity rather than by a yearning for discovery and progress, or a greed for gain.

The Oriental also prefers finesse or diplomacy to direct action; artifice in order to gain his ends, rather than a bold grappling with the actual. While not lacking in courage and capable of enormous exertion at intervals, the essential characteristic of the Asiatic mind is a love for repose; his imaginative and reflective powers, although sometimes kindled with the fervor of passion or ambition, incline rather to quiet meditation and devious wanderings among the mazes of mystical speculation. This is characteristic of all classes.

These habits of mind, together with the customs and laws of Asia, are the result of climatic and topographical conditions; as such they have existed from the earliest period, and have, therefore, the prime element of fitness to recommend them. Hence the Asiatic sees that they are in the main beneficial; nothing in his environment suggests the necessity for a radical change, while the narrowness of view common to all men, the failure to perceive the relations of things, makes it difficult for him to apprehend why what is good in his own country should not be equally fit in Europe. Another point to consider in this connection is the fact that the Asiatic is naturally averse to Europeans, and therefore despises their vaunted customs and progress. If, like the Turks, he occasionally borrows some European inventions, it is chiefly because he desires the means to cope with Christendom in the event of war, while in his secret heart he curses the necessity that forces him to take ideas from the Christian. Of course, there may be exceptions, as in the case of the Japanese or of remarkable individuals elsewhere, but this is the candid opinion of most Asiatics. In other words, they prefer to travel the journey of life according to the conditions which originally shaped the Oriental mind. As the youth whose natural bent being for the army is forced into the church looks askance at his untoward destiny, so Asiatics owe Europe a grudge whenever swayed by her influence they turn aside from the path they are naturally fitted to follow.

The lofty, not to say arrogant, tone and condescending manner of Europeans when dealing with Orientals even in diplomatic transactions has further increased the dislike of Asiatics and disqualified them from approving the civilization of Europe. The Asiatic is proud, and if ever pride were justifiable, the privilege may well be claimed by him. What European people can boast a tithe of the antiquity of China or Persia? The Persian, for example, may not know as much of exact science as the European, but the glowing strophes of her poets magnifying the exploits

of her heroes have been sung to him since infancy, and he knows well that from the mysterious plateaus of Irân Europe drew her first lessons in art, philosophy, and even science; that the genius of Alexander was developed fighting with Persians; and that the legions and emperors of Rome, searching the wide world for fresh con quests, were baffled only in one quarter, were over and over again hurled back shattered and dismayed by the ancestors of those very men who still wield intellectual and civic power in that ancient land. The Persian never for a moment forgets these facts. The nations of Europe are but as noisy children to him whose hoary empire, enveloped in the sublime solitude of age as with a mantle, sits majestic among the slowly-moving eras, and beholds from its height the endless procession of princedoms and kingdoms and empires filing past to a common oblivion.

Another feature that intensifies the Oriental's self-content is derived from his religion. The great cults, the correlated religious forces of Asia, have not only added much to literature that is sublime and beautiful, but their theology is often elevating as well, and is quite sufficient to tax the reflective powers of the deepest thinker. The puerilities laid to their charge are of scarcely more moment than certain passages in the Christian Scriptures, which are not deemed to affect the essential truths of the Bible. As regards morals, Asiatics may justly claim that the example set them by the majority of the Christians they encounter, the bad faith, cruelty, rapacity, greed, and licentiousness of those who vaunt themselves as better than Orientals, are not such as to arouse a burning enthusiasm in the bosom of the shrewd and observant Asiatic; nor is he slow to diagnose the pharisaism that thinly disguises the ambitious encroachments of European governments upon his territory.

The religions of Brahm, of Buddh, of Mohamet, are qualified to produce content, and the element of fatalism, so prominent a feature of Islamism, deepens this pervading content; content in turn is qualified to lead to self-satisfaction, and hence the Asiatic, profoundly satisfied with himself and his environment, considers himself infinitely superior to all others. The curiosity and surprise that the magnificent spectacles of Europe might arouse do not, therefore, produce more than a passing impression. After a feverish round of sight-seeing and dissipation in Christian lands, he returns to his country perfectly satisfied with its quietistic thought, its life of repose. From thence he looks back to the activity of Europe without a sigh. The perpetual restlessness of the West, its everlasting struggle with the problems that seem to make for progress, appear to him like the endless effort of Sisyphus, ever rolling the rock of progress to the top of the hill but to have it roll to the foot again, and when one reform is accomplished to begin another in the unending round of exertion.

Such are some of the reasons why an Oriental may, in his turn, fail to appreciate the good in European civilization, as the European fails to understand that of Asia. Candor suggests that each has good reasons for the faith that is in him. Both furnish complementary phases of character and civilization, and while each may be susceptible of modification and improvement, it would be a misfortune to the world if either were entirely abolished.

S. G. W. BENJAMIN.

II.

THE MONEY VALUE OF A HUMAN LIFE.

THAT which we call a human life has always been recognized as having to its possessor, and perhaps to others by reason of affection, a paramount and immeasurable value. That it may have also a money value has been acknowledged in various ways, notably in the institution of slavery. From early times the ownership of the services of a human being has had a worth in accordance with the excess of earnings obtainable above the necessary cost of subsistence. This value has not usually been computed with accuracy in each individual case, but in a general way a price has been fixed for a slave, taking into consideration his age, physical condition, and capacity for the kind of service desired of him.

It is clear, however, that certain important elements are either wholly lacking

or but partially developed, in the case of the life of a person held in bondage, which may be present if the possessor of the life is free and independent. Self-interest, ambition, and family ties are needed to develop the highest value of a human life, and it is my purpose to show that such a life has qualities which may impart to it a worth as real and as ascertainable as that of other property.

In the markets of the world, that which is commonly known as property depends for its value upon what can be obtained from it over and above the cost entailed by its possession. Sometimes this surplus is sure and constant; sometimes it is uncertain and fluctuating, and sometimes it is wholly prospective. In fixing the price, all these qualities will be considered, and the result will rest upon a combination of probabilities. The purchaser of a business block, for example, will calculate the rentals on the one hand and the taxes, repairs, and necessary expenditures on the other. The remainder will show upon what sum as a principal this will offer a fair return as compared with other investments. But this is not all, nor, indeed, is it the most important consideration. If the building is composed of, or surrounded by, inflammable materials, so that the hazard of its destruction by fire is great, its value will be seriously and unfavorably affected. It is true that institutions have been organized to distribute such losses, but as the property-owner must pay for protection his full share of the risk, which will be accurately and intelligently estimated, the value which his building would have, were it not for this hazard, will be diminished by just the chance of that contingency. The present condition of the structure, viewed in the light of natural decay and its adaptability to the needs of the location and times, will demand intelligent discrimination.

The amount, therefore, which an investor will pay for the block will be determined by his knowledge of what it now produces and his estimate both of what it will yield in the future and the time when, either by gradual deterioration or by sudden accident, it will become unable to afford an income. If there can be obtained from it more than will suffice to meet necessary expenditures, then the property has an actual value which will vary according to the estimate that may be made of its future. That neighborhood which to-day attracts business by the elegance of its buildings or its nearness to lines of travel or transportation may to-morrow be swept by fire or damaged by changes in modes of conveyance. No human foresight can provide with certainty for these contingencies, but the general future of a section is estimated by the careful student of the laws underlying commercial transactions, with an accuracy which, on the whole, enables him to reap the profits that legitimately belong to high intelligence. In the change of ownership the purchaser thinks that he is receiving more than an equivalent for his money; else he would not buy. The seller differs as to the probable future, and believes that what he now receives will be of greater value; otherwise he would retain his possession. The result, in almost any particular transaction, will show that one or the other has materially erred in his estimate, but, as a whole, real estate, or any other property which is valued for its income, will be found to conform to the general law which governs the value of money.

Can human lives possess attributes which will give to them real values? It would not be difficult to enumerate many lives which cannot be considered of any pecuniary worth because, for various reasons, they produce nothing. Such are those of the very old, the imbeciles, and the confirmed invalids. But my purpose is to show that a life surrounded by fairly supposable circumstances, such as exist in every community, has a definite value.

Every man who earns or produces more than suffices for his actual personal expenses is of pecuniary value to some one besides himself. It may be that a family is dependent upon him for support, or he may accumulate his surplus income for the benefit of heirs or charity. No matter what the purpose is, there is a value to some one in his services. Suppose he has earned $2,000 during the year, and his food, clothing, shelter, and other strictly personal expenditures have amounted to $500. Then clearly he has been of the value of $1,500 to some one during that time. We can measure the value of the years which have passed. Can we estimate with accuracy those which are to com[illegible]?

Careful observations, extending over many years, in widely-separated countries and among various nations, have demonstrated that the mortality of the human family is governed by a law which is constant in its operation. That inevitable power, death, working through its numberless agencies, by disease, accident, and violence, and seeming to seek its victims by chance, is ruled by an intelligence which preserves the balance of population, directs the laws of supply and demand, and renders possible the various calculations upon which the commerce of the world is based.

The most extensive compilations of statistics, and the most precise calculations which have been made in search of the law of mortality, are those derived from investigations among what are known as selected lives, or those which are unimpaired by hereditary taint, and are found by the examination of physicians to be practically free from disease. A mortality table was constructed in 1843 from careful observations among a large number of such lives whose course could be accurately traced, and numerous more recent investigations have served to confirm the substantial correctness of the death-rate which was then shown to exist.

Let us suppose that the man whose surplus earnings are $1,500 a year is thirty years of age and in good health, and that money is worth 4 per cent. per annum. By the mortality table, to which allusion has been made, the present value of the future surplus earnings of this life is $25,560.

It is true that this value is based on averages, and that the assumption that he will, through his life, receive and spend just the amounts here set down will not probably be realized. It is well-nigh certain that his death will occur either before or after the date here fixed. Disease or accident may rob him permanently of his productive power. Circumstances which no skill guided by research can calculate, and no judgment foretell, may change the current of his life, and enhance or diminish the value of his efforts. And yet this value rests upon a foundation composed of elements no more uncertain than those which determine the worth of the business block. Both the building and the life are constantly exposed to the danger of destruction, but that chance can be measured even more accurately in the latter case than in the former.

The natural ability of one man is greater than that of another, and this advantage will be shown in the value of their respective services. These qualities, as well as those of industry and perseverance, are inborn traits, and will, considered in connection with education and training, determine the amount for which the possessor can lease his efforts to others or employ them for independent profit. What nature has done for the man corresponds with the location of the building. What experience has taught him is like the quality of the structure. In each case there are certain necessary expenditures which must be met before any real value can exist, and in each case the worth rests upon estimates.

JOHN M. HOLCOMBE.

III.

NAVAL EDUCATION IN THE FUTURE.

THE advent of new cruisers and battle-ships to the navy of the United States has given rise to an imperative demand for change in the old system of drill and training so long in vogue in the service. That such a change has become necessary is now evident to the officials of the Navy Department, and is apparent in the recent order of the Secretary of the Navy convening a board of prominent officers, instructed to examine carefully and report for adoption a method of training and drill compatible with the times. The work which this board has in hand is an all-important one. In effecting the end desired, obstacles in every imaginable form will be encountered, not the least of which will be the opposition arising from the older officers, who are opposed to all innovation. It is not an easy matter to impress upon the adherents of the old school the fact that the days of "yard-arm" fighting, when hand-grenades, cutlasses, and pikes were powerful adjuncts in deciding engagements, when for hours ships manœuvred for position before "closing in," are irretrievably of the

past, and that methods of fighting in keeping with the scientific developments of the day will characterize future combats on the sea.

One is fairly well able to calculate beforehand the result of a naval engagement of to-day, provided there are at hand official data of the battery and armor strength, speed, and manœuvring powers of the opposing vessels. In such calculations the personal equation is not considered when great discrepancy exists in the comparative efficiency of the opposing vessels; but let there be a near approach to similitude, and the engagement can, with safety, be adjudged as resultant in favor of the better disciplined and trained crews, to the forces combining bravery and daring with the employment of modern fighting tactics. History furnishes many instances of numerically-inferior forces gaining victories by reason of their high state of discipline and training; and though naval forces of to-day depend greatly on vessel types to give them victory, there is, nevertheless, a demand for discipline and training of an even higher state than has been known in the past.

But it must not be forgotten that there is a vast difference between discipline and training. A crew may be thoroughly disciplined, and yet be ignorant of the most important duties a thorough knowledge of which can alone insure success. On the other hand, a trained crew, efficient in every sense of the word, may be sadly lacking in discipline. It not uncommonly happens that the crews noted for their smartness, and especially so when brought into competition with others, are the most unruly. The same is true of the land service. The battalion that passes the reviewing-stand without a break, that executes manœuvre after manœuvre with perfection in every detail, is not always the command that shows the least number of names on its misdemeanor report. The Germans are fully cognizant of this fact, and Prince Kraft has taken occasion in his artillery report to remark that he has often found the poorest-showing batteries and battalions on review to be better disciplined and more orderly commands than others far superior to them in training.

Within the past decade tremendous strides have been made by the navies of Great Britain and France towards obtaining a higher state of efficiency. In the case of the French service, the progress has, perhaps, been the most marked. France has attempted to do more than make sailors of her men. She has endeavored to make them soldiers as well, and, as evidence of what her naval forces are capable of accomplishing ashore, she proudly points to the showing made by the men from the Brest fleet when stationed in the trenches before Paris. To these sailor battalions was universally accorded the honor of having in their ranks the best fighting men about Paris. What France has accomplished with her naval forces appears to be the aim of efforts recently instituted by the naval powers. The fact of an admiral having in his squadron a force of 2,000 or 3,000 men capable of being rapidly thrown on shore and operated as a body of so many trained soldiers, is recognized as a most salient feature, and one tending to increase materially the strength of any power depending on its naval establishment for the maintenance of its foreign interests. Notwithstanding the high state of efficiency in which the British service is supposed to be, there is just now a most decided clamoring for courses of instruction more modern, more adaptable to the times.

In the United States naval service there has been absolutely nothing done—not even since the establishment of a new navy was decided upon—towards increasing the efficiency of the personnel. The drills, the training, and the routine now in force aboard our war-ships are much what they were twenty, and even thirty, years ago. The dogmatical tenacity with which members of the old school have insisted on meting out instruction and duty incident to the days of their boyhood has created that form of indifference always the result of enforcing upon the intelligent and thinking mind work long known to be not only useless and out of place, but a waste of time. The young apprentices are now being trained without regard to the new navy. The instruction which they are receiving aptly fits them for service on board a type of vessel peculiar to the "fifties." It is not to be disputed that a certain amount of sail and spar drill is good instruction for a young seaman. Let him be one of a prize crew detailed to take a merchant ship into port, and his knowledge

will be of service to him; but as to years being spent in exercises long relegated to the past, when even the most assiduous application will enable one to keep pace with modern developments, such a policy as has been pursued in the past is little short of suicidal. The British Admiralty is at least determined that the younger officers shall not waste their opportunities, and has directed, in a recent order, that in future "midshipmen shall be ordered only to 'mastless ships.'" This is to enable the time that might have been taken up by spar and sail drill to be devoted to studies important to the duties of modern naval officers.

There appears to have developed of late considerable duty for naval forces ashore. This is seen in the recent operations of British naval battalions in Egypt, of French naval forces in Tonquin, of the Germans on the east coast of Africa and in the Pacific, of the Portuguese forces on the west coast of Africa, of the Italians in the north, and of our own forces on the Isthmus of Panama and out in the Pacific. The duty of a man-of-war's man of to-day is essentially that of a soldier; the clouds of canvas which were once his delight have disappeared, even the masts themselves, and there is now left but the grim row of guns, the armory floor-like deck, and the piles of rifles, cutlasses, and revolvers. But there lacks yet the proper infusing of the military spirit. The aversion in bygone years to all pertaining to a soldier is still apparent among the older officers, as a part of the teachings of the old school. As a result, young officers are seen even now hurriedly going through a company drill, caring little, except that it enables an account to be put in the reports that such drill has been performed. One seldom sees attention paid to detail, except so far as to insure a fairly good showing when the ship is called upon to send an infantry company to "parade."

As to small-arm firing and target practice, the men know little or nothing. The navy regulations specify that so many rounds (twenty) shall be fired in a year, but the number allowed is far too small to produce any good from the practice. But little encouragement is offered to men for extra exertions, and there are no prizes, as in the British and French service, for special skill. The crews of the American war-ships are, as a rule, disciplined crews, but as crews trained in all pertaining to modern warfare they are sadly deficient.

It will become imperative, now that ships without masts are to come into service, that an expedient be devised for the exercise lost in "activity aloft." The long, broad decks of the new ships, especially those of the "Chicago," "Baltimore," "Newark," "Maine," and "Texas" type, offer every facility for the erection of gymnastic apparatus. Officers and men can alike do regular duty in this line, which will serve greatly to shake off the apathy that seizes hold of a crew little drilled. There cannot be too much attention paid to the development of the individual sailor, both to obtain a trained factor and a physically perfect one. There has been, no doubt, much odium cast on the crews of the American war-ships because of the great numbers of foreigners allowed to enlist, all of which has served to lessen the interest that officers should take in the men. It is well known that this foreign element must be got rid of before the navy will become a popular service, and there is no surer way of accomplishing both ends than by making the naval establishment a thoroughly military one. The sooner the service awakes to a realizing sense that the navy of to-day is a modern institution, a fighting factor devoid of all the romance of the past, the sooner the country will be prepared to resist all inroads from hostile sources.

G. L. CARDEN.

IV.

WILL OUR COAL SUPPLY EVER BE EXHAUSTED?

TIME was when the carbon and hydrogen which form practically the whole of our supply of fuel and the principal part of our food were inorganic—no more capable of sustaining combustion or animal life (if we except certain microcopic forms which decompose carbonic acid) than granite or slate. For vegetable life, however, the supply of food was at its maximum. Vegetable life came, generated in some unknown way by the solar energy which poured through the atmosphere and the heat energy which penetrated the earth's crust from within. Through the unimaginable ages

of the Carboniferous period a gigantic flora fed on the rich atmosphere, assimilating its carbon and hydrogen, and thereby setting free its oxygen, until it could sustain its animal life, at first in the lowest, then successively in the higher, forms.

This gigantic flora, with its enormous potential energy of chemical separation from oxygen,—an energy derived chiefly from the solar energy of that period, easily admitted and tenaciously retained by the atmosphere,—is now stored up in the earth as fuel for the future generations of our race. Future, I say, for tremendous as the annual consumption of coal, petroleum, and natural gas for a generation has been, we have as yet only begun upon the great store. Hitherto Mother Earth has been able to supply her children's needs by expending only her current income. In this latter day, however, their demands have multiplied so rapidly that she has been obliged to draw upon the capital stored up during the long ages of her maidenhood. How long will that capital last at the terrible rate at which we have begun to squander it? Is her children's prodigality actually making her poorer? or has she the power to nullify the effects of their extravagance? and are her diminishing resources due only to the decreasing energy of her natural supporter and protector, the sun?

However prodigal man may be in his use of earth's treasures, he can never annihilate one atom of her substance or transport it beyond her domain. In his "wasteful" consumption of fuel, he is only restoring its elements to their primeval condition as constituents chiefly of the aërial and aqueous oceans which surround our globe. It follows, then, that the more rapid the combustion, the richer becomes the atmosphere in its power to sustain and force vegetable growth. If it were possible for that period, so often predicted, to arrive, when the 6,000,000,000,000 tons, more or less, of fossil fuels now stored up in the earth's coal-bins, shall have been consumed, the atmosphere will simply have returned to its primeval condition, that which preceded the Carboniferous period. The only essential difference, therefore, which will mark the two remote geologic periods, the past and the future, will be due to whatever reduction will have taken place in the sun's energy. But whether that condition is destined ever to return to earth or not, one thing is certain: *it will not be through human instrumentality.* Ages before its arrival the percentage of carbonic acid in the atmosphere will have passed the point possible to the continuance of human life.

If not through human agency, then how is it to come? Certainly not by any of the processes now in operation. The percentage of carbonic acid in the atmosphere does not materially vary. This fact means simply that somewhere on the earth's surface vegetation is taking up the enormous surplus of carbonic acid constantly pouring forth from our millions of furnaces, and thus restoring it to the form of available fuel. The weight that is constantly sinking is thus being constantly relifted by the daily conversion of solar to vital energy.

Only some stupendous convulsion of nature, like those dreamed of by John of Patmos and Lord Byron, in which "the elements shall melt with fervent heat," can undo the work of the Carboniferous ages,—some tremendous upheaval in which the subterranean stores of fuel shall at once be laid bare and given over to the devouring oxygen. Then would a new cycle begin, another carboniferous era, in which the store-houses would be again slowly filled for future generations of men. Again and again might the cycle return, until the diminishing energy of the sun should fail to uplift the fallen weight, to reorganize the inorganic.

EDWARD P. JACKSON.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXCVI.

NOVEMBER, 1889.

IS DIVORCE WRONG?

BY CARDINAL GIBBONS, BISHOP HENRY C. POTTER, AND COLONEL ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

The attention of the public has been particularly directed of late to the abuses of divorce, and to the facilities afforded by the complexities of American law, and by the looseness of its administration, for the disruption of family ties. Therefore THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW has opened its pages for the thorough discussion of the subject in its moral, social, and religious aspects, and some of the most eminent leaders of modern thought have contributed their opinions. The Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D., who is a specialist on the subject of divorce, has prepared some statistics touching the matter, and, with the assistance of Bishop Potter, the four following questions have been formulated as a basis for the discussion :

1. Do you believe in the principle of divorce under any circumstances?
2. Ought divorced people to be allowed to marry under any circumstances?
3. What is the effect of divorce on the integrity of the family?
4. Does the absolute prohibition of divorce where it exists contribute to the moral purity of society?

EDITOR N. A. R.

Introduction by the Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D.

I AM to introduce this discussion with some facts and make a few suggestions upon them. In the dozen years of my work at this problem I have steadily insisted upon a broad basis of fact

as the only foundation of sound opinion. We now have a great statistical advance in the report of the Department of Labor. A few of these statistics will serve the present purpose.

There were in the United States 9,937 divorces reported for the year 1867 and 25,535 for 1886, or a total of 328,716 in the twenty years. This increase is more than twice as great as the population, and has been remarkably uniform throughout the period. With the exception of New York, perhaps Delaware, and the three or four States where special legislative reforms have been secured, the increase covers the country and has been more than twice the gain in population. The South apparently felt the movement later than the North and West, but its greater rapidity there will apparently soon obliterate most existing differences. The movement is well-nigh as universal in Europe as here. Thirteen European countries, including Canada, had 6,540 divorces in 1876 and 10,909 in 1886—an increase of 67 per cent. In the same period the increase with us was 72.5 per cent. But the ratios of divorce to population are here generally three or four times greater than in Europe. The ratios to marriage in the United States are sometimes as high as 1 to 10, 1 to 9, or even a little more for single years. In heathen Japan for three years they were more than 1 to 3. But divorce there is almost wholly left to the regulation of the family, and practically optional with the parties. It is a retransferrence of the wife by a simple writing to her own family.

1. The increase of divorce is one of several evils affecting the family. Among these are hasty or ill-considered marriages, the decline of marriage and the decrease of children,—too generally among classes pecuniarily best able to maintain domestic life,—the probable increase in some directions of marital infidelity and sexual vice, and last, but not least, a tendency to reduce the family to a minimum of force in the life of society. All these evils should be studied and treated in their relations to each other. Carefully-conducted investigations alone can establish these latter statements beyond dispute, although there can be little doubt of their general correctness as here carefully made. And the conclusion is forced upon us that the toleration of the increase of divorce, touching as it does the vital bond of the family, is so far forth a confession of our western civilization that it despairs of all remedies for ills of the family, and is becoming willing, in

great degree, to look away from all true remedies to a dissolution of the family by the courts in all serious cases. If this were our settled purpose, it would look like giving up the idea of producing and protecting a family increasingly capable of enduring to the end of its natural existence. If the drift of things on this subject during the present century may be taken as prophetic, our civilization moves in an opposite direction in its treatment of the family from its course with the individual.

2. Divorce, including these other evils related to the family, is preëminently a social problem. It should therefore be reached by all the forces of our great social institutions—religious, educational, industrial, and political. Each of these should be brought to bear on it proportionately and in coöperation with the others. But I can here take up only one or two lines for further suggestion.

3. The causes of divorces, like those of most social evils, are often many and intricate. The statistics for this country, when the forty-three various statutory causes are reduced to a few classes, show that 20 per cent. of the divorces were based on adultery, 16 on cruelty, 38 were granted for desertion, 4 for drunkenness, less than 3 for neglect to provide, and so on. But these tell very little, except that it is easier or more congenial to use one or another of the statutory causes, just as the old "omnibus clause," which gave general discretion to the courts in Connecticut, and still more in some other States, was made to cover many cases. A special study of forty-five counties in twelve States, however, shows that drunkenness was *a* direct or indirect cause in 20.1 per cent. of 29,665 cases. That is, it could be found either alone or in conjunction with others, directly or indirectly, in one-fifth of the cases.

4. Laws and their administration affect divorce. New York grants absolute divorce for only one cause, and New Jersey for two. Yet New York has many more divorces in proportion to population, due largely to a looser system of administration. In seventy counties of twelve States 68 per cent. of the applications are granted. The enactment of a more stringent law is immediately followed by a decrease of divorces, from which there is a tendency to recover. Personally, I think stricter methods of administration, restrictions upon remarriage, proper delays in hearing suits, and some penal inflictions for cruelty, desertion,

neglect of support, as well as for adultery, would greatly reduce divorces, even without removing a single statutory cause. There would be fewer unhappy families, not more. For people would then look to real remedies instead of confessing the hopelessness of remedy by appeals to the courts. A multitude of petty ills and many utterly wicked frauds and other abuses would disappear. "Your present methods," said a Nova Scotian to a man from Maine a few years ago, "are simply ways of multiplying and magnifying domestic ills." There is much force in this. But let us put reform of marriage laws along with these measures.

5. The evils of conflicting and diverse marriage and divorce laws are doing immense harm. The mischiefs through which innocent parties are defrauded, children rendered illegitimate, inheritance made uncertain, and actual imprisonments for bigamy grow out of divorce and remarriage, are well known to most. Uniformity through a national law or by conventions of the States has been strongly urged for many years. Uniformity is needed. But for one, I have long discouraged too early action, because the problem is too difficult, the consequences too serious, and the elements of it still too far out of our reach for any really wise action at present. The government report grew immediately out of this conviction. It will, I think, abundantly justify the caution. For it shows that uniformity could affect at the utmost only a small percentage of the total divorces in the United States. *Only 19.9 per cent. of all the divorced who were married in this country obtained their divorces in a different State from the one in which their marriage had taken place, in all these twenty years, 80.1 per cent. having been divorced in the State where married.* Now, marriage on the average lasts 9.17 years before divorce occurs, which probably is nearly two-fifths the length of a married life before its dissolution by death. From this 19.9 per cent. there must, therefore, be subtracted the large migration of married couples for legitimate purposes, in order to get any fair figure to express the migration for divorce. But the movement of the native population away from the State of birth is 22 or 23 per cent. This, however, includes all ages. For all who believe that divorce itself is generally a great evil, the conclusion is apparently inevitable that the question of uniformity, serious as it is, is a very small part of the great legal problem demanding solution at our hands. This general problem, aside from its graver features in the more im-

mediate sphere of sociology and religion, must evidently tax our publicists and statesmen severely. The old temptation to meet special evils by general legislation besets us on this subject. I think comparative and historical study of the law of the family, (the *Familienrecht* of the Germans), especially if the movement of European law be seen, points toward the need of a pretty comprehensive and thorough examination of our specific legal problem of divorce and marriage law in this fuller light, before much legislation is undertaken.

SAMUEL W. DIKE.

HOWEVER much men may differ in their views of the nature and attributes of the matrimonial contract, and in their concept of the rights and obligations of the marriage state, no one will deny that these are grave questions ; since upon marriage rests the family, and upon the family rest society, civilization, and the highest interests of religion and the state. Yet, strange to say, divorce, the deadly enemy of marriage, stalks abroad to-day bold and unblushing, a monster licensed by the laws of Christian states to break hearts, wreck homes, and ruin souls. And passing strange is it, too, that so many, wise and far-seeing in less weighty concerns, do not appear to see in the ever-growing power of divorce a menace not only to the sacredness of the marriage institution, but even to the fair social fabric reared upon matrimony as its corner-stone.

God instituted in Paradise the marriage state and sanctified it. He established its law of unity and declared its indissolubility. By divine authority Adam spoke when of his wife he said: "This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh ; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife : and they shall be two in one flesh."* But like other things on earth, marriage suffered in the fall ; and little by little polygamy and divorce began to assert themselves against the law of matrimonial unity and indissolubility. Yet the ideal of the marriage institution never faded away. It survived, not only among the chosen people, but even among the nations of heathendom, disfigured much, 'tis true, but with its ancient beauty never wholly destroyed.

When, in the fulness of time, Christ came to restore the things that were perishing, he reasserted in clear and unequivocal terms

* Gen., ii., 23-24.

the sanctity, unity, and indissolubility of marriage. Nay, more. He gave to this state added holiness and a dignity higher far than it had "from the beginning." He made marriage a sacrament, made it the type of his own never-ending union with his one, spotless spouse, the church. St. Paul, writing to the Ephesians, says: "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. . . . For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh."*

In defence of Christian marriage, the church was compelled from the earliest days of her existence to do frequent and stern battle. But cultured pagan, and rough barbarian, and haughty Christian lord were met and conquered. Men were taught to master passion, and Christian marriage, with all its rights secured and reverenced, became a ruling power in the world.

The Council of Trent, called, in the throes of the mighty moral upheaval of the sixteenth century, to deal with the new state of things, again proclaimed to a believing and an unbelieving world the Catholic doctrine of the holiness, unity, and indissolubility of marriage, and the unlawfulness of divorce. The council declared no new dogmas: it simply reaffirmed the common teaching of the church for centuries. But some of the most hallowed attributes of marriage seemed to be objects of peculiar detestation to the new teachers, and their abolition was soon demanded. "The leaders in the changes of matrimonial law," writes Professor Woolsey, "were the Protestant reformers themselves, and that almost from the beginning of the movement. . . . The reformers, when they discarded the sacramental view of marriage and the celibacy of the clergy, had to make out a new doctrine of marriage and of divorce."† The "new doctrine of marriage and of divorce," pleasing as it was to the sensual man, was speedily learned and as speedily put in practice. The sacredness with which Christian marriage had been hedged around began to be more and more openly trespassed upon, and restive

* Ephes., v., 25-31.

† "Divorce and Divorce Legislation," by Theodore D. Woolsey, 2d Ed., p. 126.

shoulders wearied more and more quickly of the marriage yoke when divorce promised freedom for newer joys.

To our own time the logical consequences of the "new doctrine" have come. To-day "abyss calls upon abyss," change calls for change, laxity calls for license. Divorce is now a recognized presence in high life and low; and polygamy, the first-born of divorce, sits shameless in palace and in hovel. Yet the teacher that feared not to speak the words of truth in bygone ages is not silent now. In no uncertain tones, the church proclaims to the world to-day the unchangeable law of the strict unity and absolute indissolubility of valid and consummated Christian marriage.

To the question then, "Can divorce from the bond of marriage ever be allowed?" the Catholic can only answer NO. And for this NO, his first and last and best reason can be but this: "*Thus saith the Lord.*"

As time goes on the wisdom of the church in absolutely forbidding divorce from the marriage bond grows more and more plain even to the many who deny to this prohibition a divine and authoritative sanction. And nowhere is this more true than in our own country. Yet our experience of the evils of divorce is but the experience of every people that has cherished this monster.

Let us take but a hasty view of the consequences of divorce in ancient times. Turn only to pagan Greece and Rome, two peoples that practised divorce most extensively. In both we find divorce weakening their primitive virtue and making their latter corruption more corrupt. Among the Greeks morality declined as material civilization advanced. Divorce grew easy and common, and purity and peace were banished from the family circle. Among the Romans divorce was not common until the latter days of the Republic. Then the flood-gates of immorality were opened, and, with divorce made easy, came rushing in corruption of morals among both sexes and in every walk of life. "Passion, interest, or caprice," Gibbon, the historian, tells us, "suggested daily motives for the dissolution of marriage; a word, a sign, a message, a letter, the mandate of a freedman, declared the separation; the most tender of human connections was degraded to a transient society of profit or pleasure." * Each succeeding generation witnessed moral corruption more general, moral degradation more profound; men and women were no longer ashamed of

* "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," Milman's Ed., Vol. III., p. 236.

licentiousness; until at length the nation that became mighty because built on a pure family fell when its corner-stone crumbled away in rottenness.

Heedless of the lessons taught by history, modern nations, too, have made trial of divorce. In Europe, wherever the new gospel of marriage and divorce has had notable influence, divorce has been legalized; and in due proportion to the extent of that influence causes for divorce have been multiplied, the bond of marriage more and more recklessly broken, and the obligations of that sacred state more and more shamelessly disregarded. In our own country the divorce evil has grown more rapidly than our growth and strengthened more rapidly than our strength. Mr. Carroll D. Wright, in a special report on the statistics of marriage and divorce made to Congress in February, 1889, places the number of divorces in the United States in 1867 at 9,937, and the number in 1886 at 25,535. These figures show an increase of the divorce evil much out of proportion to our increase in population. The knowledge that divorces can easily be procured encourages hasty marriages and equally hasty separations. Legislators and judges in some States are encouraging inventive genius in the art of finding new causes for divorce. Frequently the most trivial and even ridiculous pretexts are recognized as sufficient for the rupture of the marriage bond; and in some States divorce can be obtained "without publicity," and even without the knowledge of the defendant—in such cases generally an innocent wife. Crime has sometimes been committed for the very purpose of bringing about a divorce, and cases are not rare in which plots have been laid to blacken the reputation of a virtuous spouse in order to obtain legal freedom for new nuptials. Sometimes, too, there is collusion between the married parties to obtain divorce. One of them trumps up charges; the other does not oppose the suit; and judgment is entered for the plaintiff. Every daily newspaper tells us of divorces applied for or granted, and the public sense of decency is constantly being shocked by the disgusting recital of divorce-court scandals.

We are filled with righteous indignation at Mormonism; we brand it as a national disgrace, and justly demand its suppression. Why? Because, forsooth, the Mormons are polygamists. Do we forget that there are two species of polygamy—simultaneous and successive? Mormons practise without legal recognition

the first species ; while among us the second species is indulged in, and with the sanction of law, by thousands in whose nostrils Mormonism is a stench and an abomination. The Christian press and pulpit of the land denounce the Mormons as "an adulterous generation," but too often deal very tenderly with Christian polygamists. Why ? Is Christian polygamy less odious in the eyes of God than Mormon polygamy ? Among us, 'tis true, the one is looked upon as more *respectable* than the other. Yet we know that the Mormons, as a class, care for their wives and children ; while Christian polygamists but too often leave wretched wives to starve, slave, or sin, and leave miserable children a public charge. "O divorced and much-married Christian," says the polygamous dweller by Salt Lake, "pluck first the beam from thy own eye, and then shalt thou see to pluck the mote from the eye of thy much-married, but undivorced, Mormon brother."

It follows logically from the Catholic doctrine of the unity and indissolubility of marriage, and the consequent prohibition of divorce from the marital bond, that no one, even though divorced *a vinculo* by the civil power, can be allowed by the church to take another consort during the lifetime of the true wife or husband, and such connection the church can but hold as sinful. It is written : "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another committeth adultery against her. And if the wife shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery."* Of course, I am well aware that upon the words of our Saviour as found in St. Matthew, Chap. xix., 9, many base the right of divorce from the marriage bond for adultery, with permission to remarry. But, as is well known, the Catholic Church, upon the concurrent testimony of the Evangelists Mark† and Luke,‡ and upon the teaching of St. Paul,§ interprets our Lord's words quoted by St. Matthew as simply permitting, on account of adultery, divorce from bed and board, with no right to either party to marry another.

But even if divorce *a vinculo* were not forbidden by divine law, how inadequate a remedy would it be for the evils for which so many deem it a panacea. "Divorce *a vinculo*," as Dr. Brownson truly says, "logically involves divorce *ad libitum*."‖ Now,

* Mark, x., 11, 12. † Mark, x., 11, 12. ‡ Luke, xvi., 18. § I. Cor., vii., 10, 11.
‖ Essay on "The Family—Christian and Pagan."

what reason is there to suppose that parties divorced and remated will be happier in the new connection than in the old? As a matter of fact, many persons have been divorced a number of times. Sometimes, too, it happens that, after a period of separation, divorced parties repent of their folly, reunite, and are again divorced. Indeed, experience clearly proves that unhappiness among married people frequently does not arise so much from "mutual incompatibility" as from causes inherent in one or both of the parties—causes that would be likely to make a new union as wretched as the old one. There is wisdom in the pithy saying of a recent writer: "Much ill comes, not because men and women are married, but because they are fools."*

There are some who think that the absolute prohibition of divorce does not contribute to the purity of society, and are therefore of opinion that divorce with liberty to remarry does good in this regard. He who believes the matrimonial bond indissoluble, divorce *a vinculo* evil, and the connection resulting from it criminal, can only say: "Evil should not be done that good may come." But, after all, would even passing good come from this greater freedom? In a few exceptional cases—*Yes:* in the vast majority of cases—*No.* The trying of divorce as a safeguard of purity is an old experiment, and an unsuccessful one. In Rome adulteries increased as divorces were multiplied. After speaking of the facility and frequency of divorce among the Romans, Gibbon adds:

"A specious theory is confuted by this free and perfect experiment, which demonstrates that the liberty of divorce does not contribute to happiness and virtue. The facility of separation would destroy all mutual confidence, and inflame every trifling dispute. The minute difference between a husband and a stranger, which might so easily be removed, might still more easily be forgotten."†

How *apropos* in this connection are the words of Professor Woolsey:

"Nothing is more startling than to pass from the first part of the eighteenth to this latter part of the nineteenth century, and to observe how law has changed and opinion has altered in regard to marriage, the great foundation of society, and to divorce; and how, almost *pari passu*, various offences against chastity, such as concubinage, prostitution, illegimate births, abortion, disinclination to family life, have increased also—not, indeed, at the same pace everywhere, or all of them equally in all countries, yet have decidedly increased on the whole."‡

Surely in few parts of the wide world is the truth of these strong

* Prof. David Swing in Chicago *Journal.*
† "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," Milman's Ed., Vol. III., p. 236.
‡ "Divorce and Divorce Legislation," 2d Ed., p. 274.

words more evident than in those parts of our own country where loose divorce laws have long prevailed.

It should be noted that, while never allowing the dissolution of the marriage bond, the Catholic Church has always permitted, for grave causes and under certain conditions, a temporary or permanent "separation from bed and board." The causes which, *positis ponendis,* justify such separation may be briefly given thus: mutual consent, adultery, and grave peril of soul or body.

It may be said that there are persons so unhappily mated and so constituted that for them no relief can come save from divorce *a vinculo,* with permission to remarry. I shall not linger here to point out to such the need of seeking from a higher than earthly power the grace to suffer and be strong. But for those whose reasoning on this subject is of the earth, earthy, I shall add some words of practical worldly wisdom from eminent jurists. In a note to his edition of Blackstone's "Commentaries," Mr. John Taylor Coleridge says:

"It is no less truly than beautifully said by Sir W. Scott, in the case of Evans *v.* Evans, that 'though in particular cases the repugnance of the law to dissolve the obligation of matrimonial cohabitation may operate with great severity upon individuals, yet it must be carefully remembered that the general happiness of the married life is secured by its indissolubility.' When people understand that they *must* live together, except for a few reasons known to the law, they learn to soften by mutual accommodation that yoke which they know they cannot shake off: they become good husbands and good wives from the necessity of remaining husbands and wives: for necessity is a powerful master in teaching the duties which it imposes. If it were once understood that upon mutual disgust married persons might be legally separated, many couples who now pass through the world with mutual comfort, with attention to their common offspring, and to the moral order of civil society, might have been at this moment living in a state of mutual unkindness, in a state of estrangement from their common offspring, and in a state of the most licentious and unrestrained immorality. In this case, as in many other cases, the happiness of some individuals must be sacrificed to the greater and more general good."

The facility and frequency of divorce, and its lamentable consequences, are nowadays calling much attention to measures of "divorce reform." "How can divorce reform be best secured?" it may be asked. Believing, as I do, that divorce is evil, I also believe that its "reformation" and its death must be simultaneous. It should cease to be. Divorce as we know it began when marriage was removed from the domain of the church: divorce shall cease when the old order shall be restored. Will this ever come to pass? Perhaps so—after many days. Meanwhile, something might be done, something should be done, to lessen the

evils of divorce. Our present divorce legislation must be presumed to be such as the majority of the people wish it. A first step, therefore, in the way of "divorce reform" should be the creation of a more healthy public sentiment on this question. Then will follow measures that will do good in proportion to their stringency. A few practical suggestions as to the salient features of remedial divorce legislation may not be out of place. Persons seeking at the hands of the civil law relief in matrimonial troubles should have the right to ask for divorce *a vinculo*, or simple separation *a mensâ et thoro*, as they may elect. The number of legally-recognized grounds for divorce should be lessened, and "noiseless" divorces forbidden. "Rapid-transit" facilities for passing through divorce courts should be cut off, and divorce "agencies" should be suppressed. The plaintiff in a divorce case should be a *bona-fide* resident of the judicial district in which his petition is filed, and in every divorce case the legal representatives of the State should appear for the defendant, and, by all means, the right of remarriage after divorce should be restricted. If divorce cannot be legislated out of existence, let, at least, its power for evil be diminished.

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS.

I AM asked certain questions with regard to the attitude of the Episcopal Church towards the matter of divorce. In undertaking to answer them, it is to be remembered that there is a considerable variety of opinion which is held in more or less precise conformity with doctrinal or canonical declarations of the church. With these variations this paper, except in so far as it may briefly indicate them, is not concerned. Nor is it an expression of individual opinion. That is not what has been asked for or attempted.

The doctrine and law of the Protestant Episcopal Church on the subject of divorce is contained in canon 13, title II., of the "Digest of the Canons," 1887. That canon has been to a certain extent interpreted by Episcopal judgments under section IV. The "public opinion" of the clergy or laity can only be ascertained in the usual way; especially by examining their published treatises, letters, etc., and perhaps most satisfactorily by the reports of discussion in the diocesan and general conventions on the subject of divorce. Among members of the Protestant Episcopal Church

divorce is excessively rare, cases of uncertainty in the application of the canon are much more rare, and the practice of the clergy is almost perfectly uniform. There is, however, by no means the same uniformity in their opinions either as to divorce or marriage.

As divorce is necessarily a mere accident of marriage, and as divorce is impossible without a precedent marriage, much practical difficulty might arise, and much difference of opinion does arise, from the fact that the Protestant Episcopal Church has nowhere defined marriage. Negatively, it is explicitly affirmed (Article XXV.) that "matrimony is not to be counted for a sacrament of the Gospel." This might seem to reduce matrimony to a civil contract. And accordingly the first rubric in the *Form of Solemnization of Matrimony* directs, on the ground of differences of laws in the various States, that "the minister is left to the direction of those laws in everything that regards the civil contract between the parties." Laws determining what persons shall be capable of contracting would seem to be included in "everything that regards the civil contract"; and unquestionably the laws of most of the States render all persons legally divorced capable of at once contracting a new marriage. Both the first section of canon 13 and the *Form of Solemnization*, affirm that, "if any persons be joined together otherwise than as God's Word doth allow, their marriage is not lawful." But it is nowhere, excepting as to divorce, declared *what the impediments are.* The Protestant Episcopal Church has never, by canon or express legislation, published, for instance, a table of prohibited degrees.

On the matter of divorce, however, canon 13, title II., supersedes, for the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, both a part of the civil law relating to the persons capable of contracting marriage, and also all private judgment as to the teaching of "the Word of God" on that subject. No minister is allowed, as a rule, to solemnize the marriage of any man or woman who has a divorced husband or wife still living. But if the person seeking to be married is the innocent party in the divorce for adultery, that person, whether man or woman, may be married by a minister of the church. With the above exception, the clergy are forbidden to administer the sacraments to any divorced and remarried person without the express permission of the bishop, unless that person be "penitent" and "in imminent danger of death." Any doubts "as to the facts of any case under section II.

of this canon" must be referred to the bishop. Of course, where there is no reasonable doubt the minister may proceed. It may be added that the sacraments are to be refused also to persons who may be reasonably supposed to have contracted marriage "otherwise," in any respect, "than as the Word of God and the discipline of this church doth allow." These impediments are nowhere defined; and accordingly it has happened that a man who had married a deceased wife's sister and the woman he had married were, by the private judgment of a priest, refused the holy communion. The civil courts do not seem inclined to protect the clergy from consequences of interference with the civil law. In Southbridge, Mass., a few weeks ago, a man who had been denounced from the altar for marrying again after a divorce obtained a judgment for $1,720 damages. The law of the church would seem to be that, even though a legal divorce may have been obtained, remarriage is absolutely forbidden, excepting to the innocent party, whether man or woman, in a divorce for adultery. The penalty for breach of this law might involve, for the officiating clergyman, deposition from the ministry; for the offending man or woman, exclusion from the sacraments, which, in the judgment of a very large number of the clergy, involves everlasting damnation.

It is obvious, then, that the Protestant Episcopal Church allows the complete validity of a divorce *a vinculo* in the case of adultery, and the right of remarriage to the innocent party. But that church has not determined in what manner either the grounds of the divorce or the "innocence" of either party is to be ascertained. The canon does not require a clergyman to demand, nor can the church enable him to secure, the production of a copy of the record or decree of the court of law by which a divorce is granted, nor would such decree indicate the "innocence" of one party, though it might prove the guilt of the other.

The effect of divorce upon the integrity of the family is too obvious to require stating. As the father and mother are the heads of the family, their separation must inevitably destroy the common family life. On the other hand, it is often contended that the destruction has been already completed, and that a divorce is only the legal recognition of what has already taken place; "the integrity of the family" can scarcely remain when either a father or mother, or both, are living in violation of the law on which

that integrity rests. The question may be asked whether the absolute prohibition of divorce would contribute to the moral purity of society. It is difficult to answer such a question, because anything on the subject must be comparatively worthless until verified by experience. It is quite certain that the prohibition of divorce never prevents illicit sexual connections, as was abundantly proved when divorce in England was put within the reach of persons who were not able to afford the expense of a special act of Parliament. It is, indeed, so palpable a fact that any amount of evidence or argument is wholly superfluous.

The *law* of the Protestant Episcopal Church is by no means identical with the opinion of either the clergy or the laity. In the judgment of many, the existing law is far too lax, or, at least, the whole doctrine of marriage is far too inadequately dealt with in the authoritative teaching of the church. The opinion of this school finds, perhaps, its most adequate expression in the report of a committee of the last General Convention forming Appendix XIII. of the "Journal" of that convention. It is, substantially, that the Mosaic law of marriage is still binding upon the church, unless directly abrogated by Christ himself; that it was abrogated by him only so far that all divorce was forbidden by him, excepting for the cause of fornication; that a woman might not claim divorce for any reason whatever; that the marriage of a divorced person until the death of the other party is wholly forbidden; that marriage is not merely a civil contract, but a spiritual and supernatural union, requiring for its mutual obligation a supernatural, divine grace; that such grace is only imparted in the sacrament of matrimony, which is a true sacrament and does actually confer grace; that marriage is wholly within the jurisdiction of the church, though the State may determine such rules and guarantees as may secure publicity and sufficient evidence of a marriage, etc.; that severe penalties should be inflicted by the State, on the demand of the church, for the suppression of all offences against the seventh commandment and sundry other parts of the Mosaic legislation, especially in relation to "prohibited degrees."

There is another school, equally earnest and sincere in its zeal for the integrity of the family and sexual purity, which would nevertheless repudiate much the greater part of the above assumption. This school, if one may so venture to combine

scattered opinions, argues substantially as follows: The type of all Mosaic legislation was circumcision; that rite was of universal obligation and divine authority. St. Paul so regarded it. The abrogation of the law requiring circumcision was, therefore, the abrogation of the whole of the Mosaic legislation. The "burden of proof," therefore, rests upon those who affirm the present obligation of what formed a part of the Mosaic law; and they must show that it has been reënacted by Christ and his Apostles or forms some part of some other and independent system of law or morals still in force. Christ's words about divorce are not to be construed as a positive law, but as expressing the ideal of marriage, and corresponding to his words about eunuchs, which not everybody "can receive." So far as Christ's words seem to indicate an inequality as to divorce between man and woman, they are explained by the authoritative and inspired assertion of St. Paul: "In Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female." A divine law is equally authoritative by whomsoever declared—whether by the Son Incarnate or by the Holy Ghost speaking through inspired Apostles. If, then, a divine law was ever capable of suspension or modification, it may still be capable of such suspension or modification in corresponding circumstances. The circumstances which justified a modification of the original divine law of marriage do still exist in many conditions of society and even of individual life. The Protestant Episcopal Church cannot, alone, speak with such authority on disputed passages of Scripture as to justify her ministers in direct disobedience to the civil authority, which is also "ordained of God." The exegesis of the early church was closely connected with theories about matter, and about the inferiority of women and of married life, which are no longer believed.

Of course this is a very brief statement. As a matter of fact the actual effect of the doctrine and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church on marriage and divorce is that divorce among her members is excessively rare; that it is regarded with extreme aversion; and that the public opinion of the church maintains the law as it now is, but could not be trusted to execute laws more stringent. A member of the committee of the General Convention whose report has been already referred to closes that report with the following protest:

"The undersigned finds himself unable to concur in so much of the [proposed] canon as forbids the holy communion to a truly pious and godly woman who has been

compelled by long years of suffering from a drunken and brutal husband to obtain a divorce, and has regularly married some suitable person according to the established laws of the land. And also from so much of the [proposed] canon as may seem to forbid marriage with a deceased wife's sister."

The final action on these points, which has already been stated, indicates that the proposed report thus referred to was, in one particular at least, in advance of the sentiment of the church as expressed in her General Convention.

HENRY C. POTTER.

Question (1). *Do you believe in the principle of divorce under any circumstances?*

THE world for the most part is ruled by the tomb, and the living are tyrannized over by the dead. Old ideas, long after the conditions under which they were produced have passed away, often persist in surviving. Many are disposed to worship the ancient—to follow the old paths, without inquiring where they lead, and without knowing exactly where they wish to go themselves.

Opinions on the subject of divorce have been for the most part inherited from the early Christians. They have come down to us through theological and priestly channels. The early Christians believed that the world was about to be destroyed, or that it was to be purified by fire; that all the wicked were to perish, and that the good were to be caught up in the air to meet their Lord—to remain there, in all probability, until the earth was prepared as a habitation for the blessed. With this thought or belief in their minds, the things of this world were of comparatively no importance. The man who built larger barns in which to store his grain was regarded as a foolish farmer, who had forgotten, in his greed for gain, the value of his own soul. They regarded prosperous people as the children of Mammon, and the unfortunate, the wretched and diseased, as the favorites of God. They discouraged all worldly pursuits, except the soliciting of alms. There was no time to marry or to be given in marriage; no time to build homes and have families. All their thoughts were centred upon the heaven they expected to inherit. Business, love, all secular things, fell into disrepute.

Nothing is said in the Testament about the families of the Apostles; nothing of family life, of the sacredness of home;

nothing about the necessity of education, the improvement and development of the mind. These things were forgotten, for the reason that nothing, in the presence of the expected event, was considered of any importance, except to be ready when the Son of Man should come. Such was the feeling, that rewards were offered by Christ himself to those who would desert their wives and children. Human love was spoken of with contempt. "Let the dead bury their dead. What is that to thee? Follow thou me." They not only believed these things, but acted in accordance with them; and, as a consequence, all the relations of life were denied or avoided, and their obligations disregarded. Marriage was discouraged. It was regarded as only one degree above open and unbridled vice, and was allowed only in consideration of human weakness. It was thought far better not to marry—that it was something grander for a man to love God than to love woman. The exceedingly godly, the really spiritual, believed in celibacy, and held the opposite sex in a kind of pious abhorrence. And yet, with that inconsistency so characteristic of theologians, marriage was held to be a sacrament. The priest said to the man who married: "Remember that you are caught for life. This door opens but once. Before this den of matrimony the tracks are all one way." This was in the nature of a punishment for having married. The theologian felt that the contract of marriage, if not contrary to God's command, was at least contrary to his advice, and that the married ought to suffer in some way, as a matter of justice. The fact that there could be no divorce, that a mistake could not be corrected, was held up as a warning. At every wedding-feast this skeleton stretched its fleshless finger towards bride and groom.

Nearly all intelligent people have given up the idea that the world is about to come to an end. They do not now believe that prosperity is a certain sign of wickedness, or that poverty and wretchedness are sure certificates of virtue. They are hardly convinced that Dives should have been sent to hell simply for being rich, or that Lazarus was entitled to eternal joy on account of his poverty. We now know that prosperous people may be good, and that unfortunate people may be bad. We have reached the conclusion that the practice of virtue tends in the direction of prosperity, and that a violation of the conditions of well-being brings, with absolute certainty, wretchedness and misfortune.

There was a time when it was believed that the sin of an individual was visited upon the tribe, the community, or the nation to which he belonged. It was then thought that if a man or woman had made a vow to God, and had failed to keep the vow, God might punish the entire community; therefore it was the business of the community to see to it that the vow was kept. That idea has been abandoned. As we progress, the rights of the individual are perceived, and we are now beginning dimly to discern that there are no rights higher than the rights of the individual. There was a time when nearly all believed in the reforming power of punishment—in the beneficence of brute force. But the world is changing. It was at one time thought that the Inquisition was the saviour of society; that the persecution of the philosopher was requisite to the preservation of the state, and that, no matter what happened, the state should be preserved. We have now more light. And standing upon this luminous point that we call the present, let me answer your questions.

Marriage is the most important, the most sacred, contract that human beings can make. No matter whether we call it a contract, or a sacrament, or both, it remains precisely the same. And no matter whether this contract is entered into in the presence of magistrate or priest, it is exactly the same. A true marriage is a natural concord and agreement of souls, a harmony in which discord is not even imagined; it is a mingling so perfect that only one seems to exist; all other considerations are lost; the present seems to be eternal. In this supreme moment there is no shadow—or the shadow is as luminous as light. And when two beings thus love, thus unite, this is the true marriage of soul and soul. That which is said before the altar, or minister, or magistrate, or in the presence of witnesses, is only the outward evidence of that which has already happened within; it simply testifies to a union that has already taken place—to the uniting of two mornings that hope to reach the night together. Each has found the ideal: the man has found the one woman of all the world—the impersonation of affection, purity, passion, love, beauty, and grace; and the woman has found the one man of all the world, her ideal, and all that she knows of romance, of art, courage, heroism, honesty, is realized in him. The idea of contract is lost. Duty and obligation are instantly changed into desire and joy, and two lives, like uniting streams, flow on as one.

Nothing can add to the sacredness of this marriage, to the obligation and duty of each to each. There is nothing in the ceremony except the desire on the part of the man and woman that the whole world should know that they are really married and that their souls have been united.

Every marriage, for a thousand reasons, should be public, should be recorded, should be known ; but, above all, to the end that the purity of the union should appear. These ceremonies are not only for the good and for the protection of the married, but also for the protection of their children, and of society as well. But, after all, the marriage remains a contract of the highest possible character—a contract in which each gives and receives a heart.

The question then arises, Should this marriage, under any circumstances, be dissolved ? It is easy to understand the position taken by the various churches ; but back of theological opinions is the question of contract.

In this contract of marriage, the man agrees to protect and cherish his wife. Suppose that he refuses to protect ; that he abuses, assaults, and tramples upon the woman he wed. What is her redress ? Is she under any obligation to him ? He has violated the contract. He has failed to protect, and, in addition, he has assaulted her like a wild beast. Is she under any obligation to him ? Is she bound by the contract he has broken ? If so, what is the consideration for this obligation? Must she live with him for his sake ? or, if she leaves him to preserve her life, must she remain his wife for his sake ? No intelligent man will answer these questions in the affirmative.

If, then, she is not bound to remain his wife for the husband's sake, is she bound to remain his wife because the marriage was a sacrament ? Is there any obligation on the part of the wife to remain with the brutal husband for the sake of God ? Can her conduct affect in any way the happiness of an infinite being ? Is it possible for a human being to increase or diminish the well-being of the Infinite ?

The next question is as to the right of society in this matter. It must be admitted that the peace of society will be promoted by the separation of such people. Certainly society cannot insist upon a wife remaining with a husband who bruises and mangles her flesh. Even married women have a right to personal security. They do not lose, either by contract or sacrament, the

right of self-preservation; this they share in common, to say the least of it, with the lowest living creatures.

This will probably be admitted by most of the enemies of divorce; but they will insist that while the wife has the right to flee from her husband's roof and seek protection of kindred or friends, the marriage—the sacrament—must remain unbroken. Is it to the interest of society that those who despise each other should live together? Ought the world to be peopled by the children of hatred or disgust, the children of lust and loathing, or by the welcome babes of mutual love? Is it possible that an infinitely wise and compassionate God insists that a helpless woman shall remain the wife of a cruel wretch? Can this add to the joy of Paradise, or tend to keep one harp in tune? Can anything be more infamous than for a government to compel a woman to remain the wife of a man she hates—of one whom she justly holds in abhorrence? Does any decent man wish the assistance of a constable, a sheriff, a judge, or a church, to keep his wife in his house? Is it possible to conceive of a more contemptible human being than a man who would appeal to force in such a case? It may be said that the woman is free to go, and that the courts will protect her from the brutality of the man who promised to be her protector; but where shall the woman go? She may have no friends; or they may be poor; her kindred may be dead. Has she no right to build another home? Must this woman, full of kindness, affection, health, be tied and chained to this living corpse? Is there no future for her? Must she be an outcast forever—deceived and betrayed for her whole life? Can she never sit by her own hearth, with the arms of her children about her neck, and with a husband who loves and protects her? Is she to become a social pariah, and is this for the benefit of society?—or is it for the sake of the wretch who destroyed her life?

The ground has been taken that woman would lose her dignity if marriage could be annulled. Is it necessary to lose your liberty in order to retain your moral character—in order to be pure and womanly? Must a woman, in order to retain her virtue, become a slave, a serf, with a beast for a master, or with society for a master, or with a phantom for a master?

If an infinite being is one of the parties to the contract, is it not the duty of this being to see to it that the contract is carried

out? What consideration does the infinite being give? What consideration does he receive? If a wife owes no duty to her husband because the husband has violated the contract, and has even assaulted her life, is it possible for her to feel toward him any real thrill of affection? If she does not, what is there left of marriage? What part of this contract or sacrament remains in living force? She can not sustain the relation of wife, because she abhors him; she can not remain under the same roof, for fear that she may be killed. They sustain, then, only the relations of hunter and hunted—of tyrant and victim. Is it desirable that this relation should last through life, and that it should be rendered sacred by the ceremony of a church?

Again I ask, Is it desirable to have families raised under such circumstances? Are we in need of children born of such parents? Can the virtue of others be preserved only by this destruction of happiness, by this perpetual imprisonment?

A marriage without love is bad enough, and a marriage for wealth or position is low enough; but what shall we say of a marriage where the parties actually abhor each other? Is there any morality in this? any virtue in this? Is there virtue in retaining the name of wife, or husband, without the real and true relation? Will any good man say, will any good woman declare, that a true, loving woman should be compelled to be the mother of children whose father she detests? Is there a good woman in the world who would not shrink from this herself; and is there a woman so heartless and so immoral that she would force another to bear that from which she would shudderingly and shriekingly shrink?

Marriages are made by men and women; not by society; not by the state; not by the church; not by supernatural beings. By this time we should know that nothing is moral that does not tend to the well-being of sentient beings; that nothing is virtuous the result of which is not good. We know now, if we know anything, that all the reasons for doing right, and all the reasons against doing wrong, are here in this world. We should have imagination enough to put ourselves in the place of another. Let a man suppose himself a helpless woman beaten by a brutal husband—would he advocate divorces then?

Few people have an adequate idea of the sufferings of women and children, of the number of wives who tremble when they hear the footsteps of a returning husband, of the number of chil-

dren who hide when they hear the voice of a father. Few people know the number of blows that fall on the flesh of the helpless every day, and few know the nights of terror passed by mothers who hold babes to their breasts. Compared with these, all the hardships of poverty borne by those who love each other are as nothing. Men and women truly married bear the sufferings and misfortunes of poverty together. They console each other. In the darkest night they see the radiance of a star, and their affection gives to the heart of each perpetual sunshine.

The good home is the unit of the good government. The hearth-stone is the corner-stone of civilization. Society is not interested in the preservation of hateful homes, of homes where husbands and wives are selfish, cold, and cruel. It is not to the interest of society that good women should be enslaved, that they should live in fear, or that they should become mothers by husbands whom they hate. Homes should be filled with kind and generous fathers, with true and loving mothers; and when they are so filled, the world will be civilized. Intelligence will rock the cradle; justice will sit in the courts; wisdom in the legislative halls; and above all and over all, like the dome of heaven, will be the spirit of liberty.

Although marriage is the most important and the most sacred contract that human beings can make, still when that contract has been violated, courts should have the power to declare it null and void upon such conditions as may be just.

As a rule, the woman dowers the husband with her youth, her beauty, her love—with all she has; and from this contract certainly the husband should never be released, unless the wife has broken the conditions of that contract. Divorces should be granted publicly, precisely as the marriage should be solemnized. Every marriage should be known, and there should be witnesses, to the end that the character of the contract entered into should be understood; the record should be open and public. And the same is true of divorces. The conditions should be determined, the property should be divided by a court of equity, and the custody of the children given under regulations prescribed.

Men and women are not virtuous by law. Law does not of itself create virtue, nor is it the foundation or fountain of love Law should protect virtue, and law should protect the wife, if she has kept her contract, and the husband, if he has fulfilled his. But

the death of love is the end of marriage. Love is natural. Back of all ceremony burns and will forever burn the sacred flame. There has been no time in the world's history when that torch was extinguished. In all ages, in all climes, among all people, there has been true, pure, and unselfish love. Long before a ceremony was thought of, long before a priest existed, there were true and perfect marriages. Back of public opinion is natural modesty, the affections of the heart; and in spite of all law, there is and forever will be the realm of choice. Wherever love is, it is pure; and everywhere, and at all times, the ceremony of marriage testifies to that which has happened within the temple of the human heart.

Question (2). *Ought divorced people to be allowed to marry under any circumstances?*

This depends upon whether marriage is a crime. If it is not a crime, why should any penalty be attached? Can any one conceive of any reason why a woman obtaining a divorce, without fault on her part, should be compelled as a punishment to remain forever single? Why should she be punished for the dishonesty or brutality of another? Why should a man who faithfully kept his contract of marriage, and who was deserted by an unfaithful wife, be punished for the benefit of society? Why should he be doomed to live without a home?

There is still another view. We must remember that human passions are the same after as before divorce. To prevent remarriage is to give excuse for vice.

Question (3). *What is the effect of divorce upon the integrity of the family?*

The real marriage is back of the ceremony, and the real divorce is back of the decree. When love is dead, when husband and wife abhor each other, they are divorced. The decree records in a judicial way what has really taken place, just as the ceremony of marriage attests a contract already made.

The true family is the result of the true marriage, and the institution of the family should above all things be preserved. What becomes of the sacredness of the home, if the law compels those who abhor each other to sit at the same hearth? This lowers the standard, and changes the happy haven of home into

the prison-cell. If we wish to preserve the integrity of the family, we must preserve the democracy of the fireside, the republicanism of the home, the absolute and perfect equality of husband and wife. There must be no exhibition of force, no spectre of fear. The mother must not remain through an order of court, or the command of a priest, or by virtue of the tyranny of society; she must sit in absolute freedom, the queen of herself, the sovereign of her own soul and of her own body. Real homes can never be preserved through force, through slavery, or superstition. Nothing can be more sacred than a home, no altar purer than the hearth.

Question (4). *Does the absolute prohibition of divorce where it exists contribute to the moral purity of society?*

We must define our terms. What is moral purity? The intelligent of this world seek the well-being of themselves and others. They know that happiness is the only good; and this they strive to attain. To live in accordance with the conditions of well-being is moral in the highest sense. To use the best instrumentalities to attain the highest ends is our highest conception of the moral. In other words, morality is the melody or the perfection of conduct. A man is not moral because he is obedient through fear or ignorance. Morality lives in the realm of perceived obligation, and where a being acts in accordance with perceived obligation, that being is moral. Morality is not the child of slavery. Ignorance is not the corner-stone of virtue.

The first duty of a human being is to himself. He must see to it that he does not become a burden upon others. To be self-respecting, he must endeavor to be self-sustaining. If by his industry and intelligence he accumulates a margin, then he is under obligation to do with that margin all the good he can. He who lives to the ideal does the best he can. In true marriage men and women give not only their bodies, but their souls. This is the ideal marriage; this is moral. They who give their bodies, but not their souls, are not married, whatever the ceremony may be; this is immoral.

If this be true, upon what principle can a woman continue to sustain the relation of wife after love is dead? Is there some other consideration that can take the place of genuine affection? Can she be bribed with money, or a home, or position, or by public

opinion, and still remain a virtuous woman? Is it for the good of society that virtue should be thus crucified between church and state? Can it be said that this contributes to the moral purity of the human race?

Is there a higher standard of virtue in countries where divorce is prohibited than in those where it is granted? Where husbands and wives who have ceased to love cannot be divorced, there are mistresses and lovers.

The sacramental view of marriage is the shield of vice. The world looks at the wife who has been abused, who has been driven from the home of her husband, and the world pities; and when this wife is loved by some other man, the world excuses. So, too, the husband who cannot live in peace, who leaves his home, is pitied and excused.

Is it possible to conceive of anything more immoral than for a husband to insist on living with a wife who has no love for him? Is not this a perpetual crime? Is the wife to lose her personality? Has she no right of choice? Is her modesty the property of another? Is the man she hates the lord of her desire? Has she no right to guard the jewels of her soul? Is there a depth below this? And is this the foundation of morality? this the corner-stone of society? this the arch that supports the dome of civilization? Is this pathetic sacrifice on the one hand, this sacrilege on the other, pleasing in the sight of heaven?

To me, the tenderest word in our language, the most pathetic fact within our knowledge, is maternity. Around this sacred word cluster the joys and sorrows, the agonies and ecstasies, of the human race. The mother walks in the shadow of death that she may give another life. Upon the altar of love she puts her own life in pawn. When the world is civilized, no wife will become a mother against her will. Man will then know that to enslave another is to imprison himself.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

THE HOPES OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

BY THE HON. GEORGE G. VEST, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MISSOURI.

It is not possible to anticipate the contingencies which may confront any political party in a country with so large an area as ours, where new interests and consequently new antagonisms are constantly being developed, and where suffrage, often lashed to fury by prejudice and passion, or corrupted in many localities by money or patronage, determines the issue. An accident not contemplated, a crisis unprovided for, may, of course, wreck for a time the fortunes of any party, but we are not necessarily left to conjecture as to the ultimate effect of such misfortune. Political parties have great distinctive characteristics, which run through the web and woof of their organization, as in races, communities, and individuals; and before forming an intelligent opinion as to their reasonable hopes of future success, their history and antecedents must be carefully analyzed. To assume that party management and the clamor of campaign warfare have made or unmade political parties in this country is to overlook the fact that, as a people, whatever may have been the differences of opinion on public questions, we have, by heredity and education, a deep, overruling love of liberty,—not of liberty in the abstract, posing as a goddess before the maddened populace of Paris, but that real, substantial liberty, which gives to every citizen governmental protection and imposes upon him a just share of the taxation necessary to support the government.

A careful analysis of our history will show that underneath the current of political events, disturbed as it has often been by sectional and economic antagonisms, this gulf-stream of love by the people for personal and public liberty has at last swept party organizations to success or defeat.

It is true that in 1840 and 1848 the glamour of military glory seems to have elevated to the Presidency candidates without other claims than their successful command of armies, but in 1852 the experiment signally failed, and the most distinguished soldier of the Republic was overwhelmingly defeated. Nor must it be overlooked that the election of Harrison in 1840 resulted largely from a conviction in the popular mind that the governmental patronage was being used by the leaders of the party which had controlled the country during thirty-six years, for private and partisan purposes without regard to the public good; and to rebuke these abuses, rather than to pass upon party policy or principles, was the object of voters. And so in 1848 the election of Taylor came from the belief that he had been treated unjustly by the powers at Washington during the Mexican War, and sympathy for a gallant soldier, who had won a great victory at Buena Vista against overwhelming odds, and in spite of his enemies at the national capital, bore him into the Presidential chair. It may well be said that in both of these instances the love of liberty, or of fair play and equal rights, as opposed to governmental favoritism and oppression, controlled popular action.

The first great party of the country was overthrown upon the distinct issue that it had championed the centralizing doctrines of Alexander Hamilton and the Alien and Sedition laws which violated personal liberty. The election of Jefferson over John Adams in 1800 was a rebuke to the advocates of centralization from which they did not recover, and the Federalists as a party existed only upon the pages of history until revived in the present Republican organization, their lineal political offspring. It is impossible to conclude that the absolute destruction of the Federal party and the continuous supremacy of the Democrats for nearly forty years were the result of superior leadership or campaign management. Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, John Adams, and Gouverneur Morris were men of commanding ability, and Washington himself was not unfriendly to their principles. He believed, with many other patriotic men, that only a strong government could long exist, and he was shocked by the excesses of the French Revolution into doubts as to a purely democratic system. There can be no question that, while he did not favor the monarchical doctrines of Hamilton, who believed the English

government the best ever invented, Washington was induced by his great personal regard for that statesman to look kindly upon the party of which Hamilton was the leader.

In addition to able leadership, the Federalists possessed largely the wealth and social influence of the new Republic, then concentrated in the cities of New York and Philadelphia. Jefferson tells us that upon his return from France, when he became Secretary of State, he found the *élite* of fashionable society in favor of monarchy, and that at dinner parties there were none to defend republican institutions except a few members of the two houses of Congress. To be a Democrat was to invite the suspicion of socialism in its worse form, and Jefferson himself was assailed as a Jacobin, imbued with all the tenets of the French Revolutionists.

It is not strange that with Jefferson as Secretary of State and Hamilton as Secretary of the Treasury there should have been discord in Washington's Cabinet. It culminated in the latter giving up his portfolio and retiring to Monticello. When Hamilton sent to Congress his Report on Manufactures, in which he enunciated the doctrine that Congress could impose any import duties deemed necessary in order to encourage and protect American manufactures and thereby promote the general welfare, Jefferson denounced the report, and stated to the President that it amounted to Congressional absolutism, and was in violation of the Constitution. He declared that the government was one of limited powers, and if Congress could impose duties without other limitation than their judgment of what was necessary for the general welfare, we had fought the Revolutionary War in vain, and had gone back to the worst phase of centralization. Here was the beginning of that bitter contest between the Federal and Democratic parties which destroyed the former and elected Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson to the Presidency.

Opponents of the Democratic party often assert that Jefferson favored import duties for the protection of American industries and that Madison voted in the first Congress under the Constitution for a tariff bill having this object. There is no doubt that both these great statesmen were anxious to foster domestic enterprise, then so much needed, and to secure complete independence, especially of England, from whose thraldom we had just escaped; but it is an outrage upon their fame to assert that either of them ever advanced the idea that duties could or should be imposed

without regard to the amount necessary to support the government, and limited only by the discretion of Congress. Jefferson strongly denounced the doctrine, and the tariff law passed by the first Congress, and so often quoted, expressly stated in its title that it was enacted to raise money for the support of the government and to encourage American industries.

It is not possible for any intelligent man, unless blinded by partisan zeal, to believe that Jefferson, the life-long defender of the doctrine that all citizens should share equally in the benefits and burdens of the government, the uncompromising foe of class legislation and special privilege, and Madison, his chosen friend and successor, Father of the Constitution and expounder of its limitations, ever favored, or would now favor, if living, the monstrous system under which the infant industries of 1800 have become the overgrown frauds of to-day.

No other conclusion can be reached by the impartial mind than that the Democratic party succeeded in destroying its great rival, and in holding the government for nearly forty years, because the American people believed it to be the friend of equal rights and the foe of all laws which create a partnership between the government and certain classes, by which enormous profits are secured to the latter at the expense of other citizens. This was the evil denounced by Andrew Jackson in his message vetoing the bill establishing the United States Bank, and it is the monstrous evil which confronts us now in the existing tariff system advocated by the party in power.

If a great leader and intelligent membership were all the requisites for success, the Whig party led by Henry Clay, the most eloquent and magnetic of our public men, and having in its ranks conservative and thoughtful voters in every part of the Union, ought to have survived the defeat of 1852. Mr. Clay was the ablest advocate of the protection doctrine it has ever had, and, whilst he avoided the extreme position now held by the Republicans, he clothed the dogma with all the charms of oratory, and gave it the name of the "American system." But neither oratory nor nomenclature availed. The Whig party, great and patriotic, could not touch the heart of the American people. It had a flavor of the old Federalists and, although eminently respectable, inspired no popular affection or confidence. After the defeat of General Scott for the Presidency,

the Whig organization disintegrated, a majority of its members in the Northern States joining the Republicans, and those in the Southern and Middle States allying themselves to the Democrats or to the American, or Know-nothing, party, which was wrecked in the brief space of two years by its fatal tenets of oath-bound secrecy and religious proscription.

The Democratic party then found itself face to face with an adversary far more dangerous than all its old enemies combined. Young, vigorous, enthusiastic, the Republican party gathered under a banner having for its inscription an irresistible appeal to the great heart of the American people—"Liberty to All." African slavery, for the existence of which both sections were responsible, had been imbedded in the Constitution and laws, while it was inextricably twined about the social and industrial life of the people in fifteen States of the Union. No compromise was possible, for debate only aroused passion, and the institution, protected by constitutional and statutory laws, could only be uprooted by the ploughshare of war. It was done amidst tears and blood and all the horrors of internecine strife. Democrats were upon both sides bravely fighting for the right as they saw it, but for not one instant did the party cease to exist or its flag disappear.

No more conspicuous illustration of the overruling love of the American people for liberty can be imagined than the effect upon the Democratic party of its apparent opposition to human freedom. For the first time in its history, this great organization, which had governed the country almost without interruption for sixty years, met with disaster from the irresistible logic of events. That it was not, as a party, the advocate or defender of African slavery can be seen in the fact that Jefferson and all the great Democratic leaders were opposed to the institution. The first public act of Jefferson's life was to propose in the Virginia House of Burgesses a bill providing for the gradual emancipation of slaves, and in the Ordinance of 1787 he wrote the clause declaring that in the territory ceded by Virginia to the Union "slavery and involuntary servitude is hereby forever prohibited, except in punishment for crime of which the party shall be duly convicted." The culture of cotton in the Southern States having largely increased the value of African slaves, the owners, recognizing that the prejudices of the civilized world were arrayed

against them, naturally looked to the provisions of the Constitution for protection to their property. In the Democratic party, pledged by its history and principles to a strict construction of that instrument and the faithful observance of all its guarantees, they saw the only safeguard; and it followed, therefore, that the slavery agitation found a large majority of voters in the Southern States members of the Democratic party. That the party has survived the charge, unjustly, but plausibly, made, of defending slavery is proof of its inherent vitality.

With the war perished forever African slavery upon this continent, leaving the Republican party in absolute control of the government. If a wise and generous policy had then marked its course, this control might have been indefinitely protracted ; but hardly had the sound of cannon and musketry died away before the features of the old Federalists appeared in their offspring, and violence in the place of conciliation, partisan greed rather than statesmanship, governed the party leaders. Instead of assisting the conquered South to reëstablish its broken fortunes and rebuild its ruined homes, the first step of the ruling party was to inaugurate what was called "reconstruction," or, in truth, "redestruction," under which a remorseless and rapacious horde of plunderers was turned loose upon an almost hopeless people. Instead of removing the war taxes upon the necessaries of life so as to relieve the poor, the taxes upon banks, railroads, manufactures, and incomes were taken off the rich, but remain to this day upon that portion of the people who are least able to pay them. Instead of creating a cheap and abundant circulating medium, it has been the constant endeavor of the Republicans to destroy silver and make gold the only standard. The bonds of the government payable in coin were made payable in gold, and this was followed by legislation striking the silver dollar from our coinage, and the declaration by Republican statesmen that silver should be used only as subsidiary coin.

For a time the logical result of the war was to place the Republican party in unquestioned supremacy; but as the passions of that bloody strife are gradually being allayed, and the hereditary principles and tendencies of the two great parties are again coming to view, the hopes of the Democratic party are each year brighter. Again will the American people turn to the party which has always defended the limitations and guarantees of the

Constitution, and deny their confidence to the political organization which has used the sacred name of freedom for party purposes only, and has not scrupled to debauch the suffrage, when that suffrage should be the stronghold of liberty.

In 1876 Samuel J. Tilden and in 1884 Grover Cleveland were elected to the Presidency, and at the election of 1888 a majority of the popular vote was cast for the Democratic over the Republican candidate. Is this the result of leadership, or management, or corruption? Or is it because the Democratic party has been in its long and eventful history, with all its blunders and misfortunes, the friend of popular government, and the inveterate foe of class legislation and monopolized plunder?

We have an abiding hope that the prejudices arising from civil war will disappear, and that a free people, unbought by the money of subsidized interests and uninfluenced by the appeal of demagogues, will examine dispassionately the great issue between the Republican and Democratic parties, and determine from history and argument on which side are the traditions and safeguards of free institutions.

What is this issue? It is that upon which Jefferson defeated John Adams in 1800, and which was formulated in the Report on Manufactures by Alexander Hamilton: that Congress has the power, in order to promote the general welfare, to levy such import duties as it may think necessary. In every platform of the Republican party prior to 1888 it was declared that tariff duties should be imposed sufficient to support the government, and so adjusted as to encourage American industries. The convention which nominated President Harrison at Chicago threw aside all disguise, and declared for a tariff to protect American industries without regard to revenue. This is the issue, and upon it we hope to overthrow the Republicans as signally and completely as their political progenitors were overthrown by Jefferson in 1800.

Free trade is not an issue, whatever may be the opinions of individuals, for no political party advocates it. When Mr. Cleveland honestly and bravely said to Congress that there should be a reduction of import duties, such as would relieve the taxpayer without injuring the protected interests, and pointed out how this could be done, he was assailed as a Free-Trader in order to alarm the manufacturers and obtain the campaign fund neces-

sary to purchase the floating vote in "blocks of five." This was "a good-enough Morgan" until after the election, and served the purpose of filling Senator Quay's contribution-box and putting Mr. Wanamaker in the Cabinet; but the leaders of the Republican party knew the charge to be false.

What we hope to place squarely before the people o the United States is the real question at issue—"Whether import duties shall be imposed for protection without regard to necessary revenue, or only such amount of duties as may be required to pay the expenses of government, so adjusted as to relieve from taxation the necessaries of life and at the same time encourage American manufactures." This question was not determined by the last Presidential election. Mr. Cleveland was defeated by the enormous expenditure of money extorted from the fears of the protected classes, and by the untiring efforts of the Grand Army of the Republic, whose enmity he had aroused by his brave and patriotic opposition to the wholesale system of pension robbery of which the late Commissioner Tanner has been so able an exponent. In the manufacturing States of New Jersey and Connecticut the Democrats were successful, whilst in the great military States of the Northwest, which had furnished the soldiers who conquered the South, but where there were few manufacturing establishments, they were defeated. In their steady and unswerving adherence to the course marked out in the tariff message of Mr. Cleveland is the great hope of the Democracy. "One swallow does not make a summer," and one repulse does not make disaster permanent. The truths announced in that message will prevail, and to falter in their defence is to invite defeat.

If fresh arguments are needed to prove that the position of the Republican party is untenable, and that its success can only be purchased, they are found in the present condition of Harrison's administration. It is as absolutely the property of the protected manufacturers and the Grand Army of the Republic as if the title-papers had been delivered and put to record. During the last canvass the people were promised that the import duties imposed by the present war tariff would be reduced by the Republican party so soon as they gained power. They now have the President and both houses of Congress, and we are told since the election that the surplus is to be reduced by additional pen-

sions, the Blair Bill, appropriations for a navy and coast defences, with the removal of the internal-revenue taxes on tobacco and alcohol used in the arts; and if any allusion is made to the tariff, it is hinted that a reduction of import duties will be on the basis of the Senate bill which passed that body during the last Congress. By this measure the duties were retained on salt and lumber, and increased on the fine cotton fabrics made in New England, and on woollen goods and hardware.

The Republicans cannot reduce the tariff. Their chief reliance for the funds necessary to carry the elections is upon the protected manufacturers, and the system is so dovetailed and interdependent that to attack it in any part loosens and destroys the whole fabric. It is a vast "combine," embracing in its giant grasp the whole country, and bound together by greed. Its advocates claim that the laboring man is the principal recipient of its blessings, and when during the last session of Congress it was proposed in the Senate to remove the duty upon bituminous coal, eloquent orations were delivered describing the happy homes of the coal-miners in Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Illinois, for whose benefit this duty was imposed. Not a Republican Senator failed to vote against the motion, and the tax was retained. It is to be hoped that the defenders of this tax have read, since the adjournment of Congress, the stories of famine which have come from the coal-mining districts, where desperate men and starving women, with hollow-eyed children, have waited in vain for the promised blessings of protection.

But there is another shadow at the Republican feast that will "not down." The Grand Army has thrown its iron glove into the arena, and boldly proclaims that, unless the present enormous pension list is increased from time to time, the men who saved the country "will know the reason why." There is something humiliating in the spectacle of an American President and his Cabinet cowering before this Pretorian Guard and industriously hunting ways and means to retain its favor. When the abuses of Tanner's administration of the Pension Office became so flagrant as to be no longer endurable, the ex-grand commander of the Grand Army was solicited to accept the office of Commissioner so as to placate the veterans, whose indignant murmuring over the removal of Tanner was borne to Washington; but the ex-grand commander, who at the last grand encampment had

counselled his comrades to demand a service pension for every man who had served in the Federal Army, and assured them it would be granted, knew too well the temper and power of the body over which he had presided, and declined the proffered honor. We read of something marvellously like this in the latter days of the Roman Empire, when victorious armies overawed the government and dictated laws.

It is our sincere hope that the American people will soon recognize the shameless abuse of their gratitude to the real soldiers of the Republic, which is now seen in the ever-increasing pension roll, gathering accumulated volume as we recede from the war, and which comes from measures invented by pension attorneys at Washington, and supported by Congressmen anxious to obtain the soldier vote and afraid to oppose the demands of those who are masquerading as defenders of the nation's life.

In the last Presidential election Harrison received two hundred and thirty-three electoral votes and Cleveland one hundred and sixty-eight, making the former's majority sixty-five in the Electoral College, although of the popular vote Cleveland received a majority over Harrison of 93,431. Of the electoral votes for Harrison, New York cast thirty-six and Indiana fifteen, making together fifty-one, which number taken from the vote of Harrison and added to that of Cleveland would have given the former one hundred and eighty-two and the latter two hundred and nineteen electoral votes, or a majority of thirty-seven for Cleveland.

Whilst there are now four hundred and one electoral votes, there will be in 1892, with the thirteen electoral votes of the new States, four hundred and fourteen votes in the Electoral College; and if every State votes in 1892 as in 1888, except New York and Indiana, and they support the Democratic ticket, it would be successful, although the entire thirteen votes of the new States should be given to the Republicans. If the States of New York and Indiana change to the Democrats in 1892, then the Democratic ticket would be elected, although the Republicans should carry all the new States, and also Connecticut or West Virginia. Or if the Republicans carry in 1892 all the States they carried in 1888 except New York and Indiana, they would be defeated, although they should gain the votes of all the new States except Montana, and the Democrats lose Virginia, or

West Virginia and Connecticut. In other words, if the Democrats carry New York and Indiana in 1892, together with Montana, they can lose both West Virginia and Connecticut, or Virginia, and elect their ticket, if the other States vote as in 1888 and the Republicans gain the votes of Washington and the two Dakotas.

At the last election for President, Harrison received in New York 650,338 and Cleveland 635,965 votes, while Fisk, the Prohibition candidate, had 30,231, and Streeter, the Union-Labor candidate, 626; so that Harrison had a majority of 14,373 over Cleveland, but less than a majority of all the votes in the State. In Indiana Harrison received 263,361 and Cleveland 261,013 votes, while Fisk had 9,881 and Streeter 2,694, giving Harrison a majority over Cleveland of 2,348, but only a plurality in the State. Out of 1,854,109 votes in the two States of New York and Indiana, Harrison had a majority over Cleveland of 16,721, showing that a change of *eight thousand three hundred and sixty-one* votes from the Republican to the Democratic candidate would have elected the latter President.

New York and Indiana are Democratic States, and only corrupt means can change their electoral votes. In these States must be fought the Presidential contest of 1892, and no Democrat should doubt, in view of the facts presented, that it will result in the triumphant success of our principles and the vindication of Grover Cleveland's honest and brave administration.

G. G. VEST.

OUR NATIONAL CONCEITS.

BY MURAT HALSTEAD.

CONCERNING certain conceits of our countrymen, it should be stated, before subjecting them to critical consideration, that they are to the average American citizen a precious possession. A conceit is not necessarily fanciful or false, but is rather a pleasing presumption, possibly a generous illusion, the estimation of a quality or faculty a shade beyond its actual worth, an appreciation of one's own merits that quickens into an exaggerated self-esteem, a vanity in the valuation of the things one holds, the perception of a peculiarity in that which is one's own that carries it beyond the sharp line of testimony and bestows upon it an individual flavor.

There are conceits national and conceits personal. The American citizen has something of both, and the national conceit sometimes magnifies the history of our own country at the expense of that of the other nations of the earth, and has even gone to the extent of glorifying a wrong, and vindicating, so far as it may be accomplished with arrogant assumption, errors obvious to mankind.

It is within the recollection of millions when it was one of our conceits to associate the worst form of slavery in the world with the most gaudy ideas of universal liberty. The nation, for this presumptuous sin, passed through a process of purification and education, and one of the first advantages gained through the awful sacrifice of war was the ability to see ourselves as others were seeing us. When the folly and the wrong were known, betterments became possible.

It was an American conceit that we might actually ignore the lessons that through the ages had been accumulated in the experience of men, that we might violate the great historical laws that prescribed the necessity of justice, and go on by some inherent quality, surpassing anything that had been achieved, with-

out paying the penalties of the ignorance of truth or the wantonness of error.

There was a time when American vanity prevented the great mass of the people from comprehending that we were upon the verge of civil war, and as certain to drift into it as one in the rapids above the falls of Niagara to go over the precipice; and the strangest folly was the opinion, obstinately held on either side of the line that divided the mustering armies, that those opposed would not fight. One of the guarantees of peace in the future is that we know better than that all around.

It is one of the teachings of the war that there is no peculiar exemption for the American people from the calamities that have befallen other peoples, and we have passed from the vain incredulity on the subject of war, the irritable assertion of its impossibility in the face of the currents that rendered it inevitable, to take a pride in the extraordinary extent and destructiveness of the warfare in which we were five years engaged, and the warlike capacities of the men of all the States abundantly shown.

American conceits, often aired at home, are always conspicuous abroad, and the leading purpose, if not the ruling passion, of the American in another country, especially if he has not made himself as conspicuous as he would like at home, is to inflict astonishment upon the strangers within whose gates he may be. A friend just starting for a tramp in the British islands declared that he would show the British in a few days that he "could stamp on their soil with a pair of American-made, square-toed boots." Another rejoiced, in the railroad stations of France, to rush across the tracks; and the pains the French railway officials took to prevent him from destroying himself amused him excessively. Still another occupied himself chiefly, in a tour of several weeks, shouting for ice-water and American breakfasts, and showering maledictions upon the servants who could not understand, much less accommodate, him; and he thought the louder he scolded and swore the better he was speaking the language of the land.

Once I heard an American in a smoking-room in an English hotel engaged in conversation with a British officer on the subject of the war in this country. The American was a young Kentuckian, who, desiring to impress his interlocutor with the amenities of our civilization and the refinements of home influences, had just told an anecdote of a neighbor and companion

who galloped into the county town while court was in session, his belt stuck full of revolvers and a double-barrelled shot-gun across the pommel of his saddle, and spurred his horse up and down the street, defying everything and ready to murder any and every body in a moment, and sure to get the drop on one who criticised his performance. The response of the officer to the touching narrative was that the story was "something extraordinary." He listened intently, and ventured, when the hero of the tale rode off in triumph, brandishing his shot-gun and daring the world in arms to fight, to change the subject by observing: "I suppose that the battles of the Franco-German war were far more bloody than any of those in the war in your country."

The expression of the young Kentuckian was that of indignant amazement. "No, sir," said he in thrilling tones; "the battles that were fought in my country were the bloodiest that were ever fought anywhere on earth. Now, take the battle of Shiloh; it raged without a moment's intermission for seven days and nights. When it began it was in the midst of a dense wilderness on the Tennessee, and when it was ended there was not a tree standing within nine miles of the river, and twenty thousand men were killed on each side and were dead in the fallen timber."

The British officer remarked: "It is astonishing. I think you possibly mean that there were twenty thousand men on each side killed, wounded, and missing; say forty thousand on both sides *hors du combat*. That would be sufficient, I should say, for a great battle," and he called for another brandy and soda.

"No, sir," said the citizen from old Kentucky; "there were twenty thousand dead on each side, and they were buried where they fell. There was nothing like that in the French and Dutch fighting"; and, of course, there was not. The incident may illustrate one of the phases of the conceits of the American citizen. It is not worth while for anything to happen in any other country comparable with that which occurs in the United States.

An amusing form of the pride of our countrymen is the endless self-assertion of the American traveller as to the superiority of our sleeping accommodations on the cars in the United States, and the wonderful advantages derived from the use of brass checks in relieving ourselves of the care of luggage during long journeys. The miracle of the identical trunks with the identical brass checks turning up at the right moment, without

the requirement of personal supervision, is so incessantly mentioned and regarded as a virtue, and pointed out with pride, that it is almost in the nature of a mania.

Reflection should teach the traveller, at least the travelling patriot, that such superiority as we have in methods of spending nights on the cars, and relieving ourselves of the care of trunks, grows out of the fact that we make more long journeys than any other people. Whatever merit there is in this we should entirely appreciate, though the impressiveness of perpetual boastfulness on the subject may be questioned. It is quite as indisputable as the superiority in the length of our rivers, the extent of our fresh-water lakes, and the amount of our sea-coasts, if we neglect to compare them with the shores of British North America, and Russian Asia, and Australia, that we fly about the globe with longer-range facilities than any other portion of its population.

But the persistent belief of the American abroad in the incomparable advantages of his system of roaming up and down the earth at home is something so continually met, and so pathetic in some of its aspects, that it will hardly do in treating the subject to touch it with humor. The emotions are enlisted.

It does not seem to be absolutely established that the English, French, and Germans, and other Europeans also, are semi-barbarous because they habitually build the lines of their roads heavier than we do and run trains that are lighter. They have, too, pretty good accommodations for sleeping on their through trains, though they do not, as a rule, in their sleeping-cars, tuck away great quantities of bed-clothing without ventilation in boxes overhead, where in the summer time they get the benefit of the sun from the superheated roofs; and if we make specialties of certain conveniences on our trains, we should remember the perfection of accommodations at the stations abroad.

European cars are quite well ventilated when the people themselves permit the air to circulate in them, but the average native of Europe has a conceit of the terrors of a current of air that is a weakness of the imagination happily absent in the American. It is an alarming thing in a crowded and heated car in Europe, even if there are dogs present, or gentlemen redolent of malt liquor and tobacco, to open a window. A general shudder ensues, and a gesture, if not a word, of apology is in order.

The portentous betterment of a baggage-check when it is brass rather than paper is an American specialty that will hardly bear the analysis of hostile criticism. The miracle of the brass is that it travels around and about and gets back in the same place, and keeps forever in circulation, as if it were possibly a representative of the solar system or a legal-tender coin. In Europe a check serves just once. It is a slip of paper, but if you hold it fast it is good for your luggage, no matter how far you go. If you have half a dozen pieces, they are weighed, their weight is carefully put down, and each piece of the series numbered with the same figures. The figures are on your flimsy paper scrap, and if it is ever so small and slight and blotted, it calls for all you have at the end of your journey.

Arrived in Paris from any point of the compass, no matter how much property you have in boxes and packages, if they have been intrusted to the road service, they will all turn up together at the right place, if you know enough to find it, for they are numbered as of the same lot, and your bit of paper with the corresponding figures calls for it all. Or in London you know you are to sail on a steamer from Liverpool for New York, and the number of your room; be on time at the baggage-office, and have your bags and boxes and bundles duly marked with the name of the steamer and number of room, and "for the hold" if you do not wish to see the article before crossing the ocean; and you may move confidently through the chaos of frantic people and the giddy maze of sea-trunks in circulation. Many will not, but all might. The chances are very great that nothing will be lost or mislaid. Do not indulge the conceit of fretting, but be calm, and you will find your belongings in the state-room, and at home the long-lost trunks will rush down the slide from the steamer into the hands of our accomplished custom-house officers.

The American, though, is wronged, as a rule, in his own mind, when his baggage is weighed; and to be charged a pretty lively figure for each pound that is above one-half the weight of the average human being is a source of grief for which there is no consolation, as it is unreasonable. There is not any notion more obstinate in the American traveller than that he is entitled to take half a dozen Saratoga cottages without stoves with him, and to find them thundering after him whenever he gets into his hotel; but if he has to pay charges in Europe for a few weeks

upon his ponderous *impedimenta,* he begins to grow weary and to take a more philosophical view of personal rights, for he doesn't need to carry a row of houses with or without cooking-stoves.

The most provoking of the American fancies about a foreigner to a foreigner—and everybody who has not been born in the United States is to the American citizen a foreigner, just as all the people in the days of the Roman Empire's glory, except the people of Rome themselves, were barbarians—is that he is called upon to sympathize, from the ineffable altitude of a favored being, with the down-trodden life of effete despotisms.

Mr. Lowell has remarked on the "Certain Condescension" of some eminent strangers with respect to Americans, and if the foreigner should reply, he would probably, if apt in phraseology, dwell upon that Certain Compassion with which the American citizen regards those who are so unhappy as to be identified with any country other than the Great Republic that is bounded by two oceans and a lot of ice that endures and sand that burns forever.

Shall we say it is the conceit, or the pride, or the fancy notion of the advertising American that his palatial sleeping-cars are among the most beautiful evidences of an advanced civilization, that his sixty-feet-long boxes on wheels, night or day, with a miscellaneous company of from thirty to seventy people, offer the most commodious and entertaining and luxurious method of travelling known, and that the omnibuses and carts and wagons and carriages employed in the United States are, each of its kind, so much better than any that can be constructed in Europe or Asia that it is matter of surprise that the inhabitants of all the countries and the islands of the sea do not appreciate the taste and brilliancy of all his vehiculary miracles, and send immediately to get the latest patterns, and listen with delight and awe to the hum of machinery, the buzzing of genius, and the music of the eagle ?

The American looks with scorn upon the harness of a cart-horse in London or Paris, and with good grounds in some respects certainly, for there never was any sufficient reason assigned why a horse that has a tremendous burden to draw should be loaded with a gigantic collar weighing half as much as the cart. We may hope for the ultimate emancipation from the tyranny of collars over the French horses, because the cab-drivers in Paris have discarded them and adopted the American-sized collar ; but the British harness will probably remain in its original proportions,

unimpaired by the evolutionary influences of the slow centuries. The abatement of the horse-collar in France is a great concession, and some of the conceit of the French people must, in some unaccountable way, have been taken out of them before they consented to it, if, indeed, they know what they have done.

That the American should travel through Europe bearing with him the highest estimation of the many advantages of his own country, is not only commendable in itself, but it is in every way warranted by the existing conditions. That part of the conceit of the traveller, however, which interferes with his enlightenment in those affairs in which the Europeans, through ages of experience upon the same soil, have the advantage of us, is a form which should be deprecated. It is not the true feeling of American patriotism that is conservative of the bliss of ignorance or the joys of indifference.

One thing that should take the conceit out of the American in foreign travel, so far as to bid him to recognize the eternal laws that the nations must obey, or perish, is the absence, throughout those countries of western Europe that are most familiar, of the wastefulness that exhausts the natural resources of this vast and bountiful and beautiful continent. It should be conducive to careful self-examination before indulging overbearing self-sufficiency, to remember that we do not, as a habit, go abroad in our own ships, and that the food we throw away, the fuel we scatter to the winds, the houses and goods that feed our excessive and unexampled fires, the manures we cast away, the grain we do not gather, and the fences that decay, make up an aggregate of loss that would be equal to the maintenance of the standing armies that we deplore as a burden insupportable.

It is one of the unpardonable vanities of the people of this country to hold that our land is so favored that, no matter what is done, we shall still forever have advantages warranting us in perpetual profligacy.

The American continent has not been exhausted by centuries of the impoverishing processes that are in progress, but the time approaches when it will be essential to the salvation of our country that the lessons of thrift that may be learned abroad, if we are not too blind in our pride to behold them, shall be applied at home. We must cherish the riches we have inherited or we shall be a nation of prodigal sons, without a father's house for our final refuge.

It is an American crochet that the forests may be destroyed—indeed, that slaughtering trees is the beginning of the building of greatness and the development of fertility; that the mountains may be denuded of their natural protection; that the trees, and the mosses, and the fallen brush and leaves, and the entangled ferns and shrubbery that spread over them like immense sponges for the retention of moisture—nature's reservoirs of life-giving water—shall be torn way; that the hills may be made barren for the sake of a few sticks of timber, the brooks allowed to dry up; that the grasses need not be cultivated, nor the willows planted to protect the streams;—and so we prepare for floods and droughts alternating. We rejoice in our strength, not remembering that for all these things we shall be brought to judgment. Young men and young countries must alike yield to the divine laws or brave the retribution that is sure.

In this year there have been immense areas of woodlands swept by flames, and the capacity of the new States, where the fires have raged, to support the people of the future, has been impaired. There would not have been as great losses, taking into view the generations that are to come, if cities instead of forests had perished; and yet there is not a grave sense of the public injury and general damage. Concerning these things, we need a quickened popular understanding, and that the conceit of immeasurable resources, beyond all contingencies of irretrievable disaster, should be taken out of us before it is everlastingly too late.

Already we have experienced in Virginia the destruction of the soil by the continuous cultivation of tobacco, so that the lands that a century and a half ago almost literally were fruitful of gold when scratched with the hoe, are now wretchedly poor, productive only of a shabby second growth of timber. The oyster-beds that were the treasures on the coasts, and made the secluded bays that indent our shores reservoirs of wealth beyond computation, have been so cruelly robbed that not far in the future the succulent, excellent, and cheap food, eagerly sought far and near, will have been so far consumed and destroyed that the most rigid economy and careful cultivation can never restore the original opulence that, carefully husbanded, would have been exhaustless as the fisheries of the deep seas.

Shall we not be taught to care for our national inheritance until there are consumed, in our remorseless extravagance, the

virgin riches of the soil, the exuberance of the forests, the food fishes of the streams, the herds that were nourished by the grasses now burned, the flocks of wild fowl that made the marshes musical and darkened the skies? When shall the conceit be taken out of the American people that they are so cared for by a bountiful Providence, whose lavish hand shall pour upon them perennially from horns of plenty, that they can afford to squander in heedless profusion the resources with which the continent was wonderfully endowed?

One of the troubles of the American traveller in Europe, forced upon his attention, is that of obtaining wholesome drinking-water, and he compares his own country with those abroad in that respect, greatly to the disadvantage of the foreigner, and wonders why there are typhoid fever and poisoning from the use of bad water, and he grows weary even of the command of his medical adviser to drink beer and wine; and is forgetful of the Schuylkill that is the affliction of Philadelphia, and the poor water-supplies of the growing cities of New Jersey, and the malarious ice from the Hudson that sickens New York.

What shall move him to cast his eye far along through the years, and try to think of himself as an American citizen some centuries hence, or of the conditions of life that will be upon his children's children? What does he suppose will be the effect upon the water-supply when the woods are wantonly destroyed, and the rivers are dry beds or muddy torrents, and when the leading improvement which a city finds itself called upon to provide itself with is that the drainage, which should restore the wasted soil, shall be flushed into the streams, and at the same time that the water-supply shall be taken from them? Of course, the time must come when there shall be fever and no food in the rivers. The shameful and corroding sin of their pollution cannot go on forever without the appropriate penalty in poverty and pestilence, to warn the human race that lives of thrift, and industry in all good works, and cleanliness, and habits of caring for the general welfare, under competent laws enforced by enlightened public opinion, are requisite to the health, the prosperity, and the happiness of the whole people.

A conceit that should be removed from the American mind, as it might be without the loss of healthy self-consideration, is that these United States constitute the only country where there

has been during the latest generation marked advancement. The truth is that all countries have improved in the era of railways and telegraphs, of steam and steel, the discoveries of the gold of California and the silver of Nevada, the rapidity and comfort of intercourse between nations and continents, the diffusion of intelligence by the press, and the wonders of mechanical achievements that have cheapened and bettered the housing, clothing, feeding, and teaching, and broadened and heightened all the possibilities of the education and comfortableness of mankind.

One who would be above or beyond the conceits that confine or narrow comprehension of surroundings should not limit himself, in regarding the progressive developments of the age, to the American horizon, for there are other countries than ours, though none are fairer, that have grown as rapidly as our own. We are not exclusive in our grand progress. The increase of wealth, material improvement, and popular advantages in Scotland, within forty years, has been almost equal to that of any State of the United States. Even Ireland is emerging from the gloom of her long impoverishment. And it is only to welcome the common light in the universe belonging to all civilization, to recognize, as it shines in our faces, that while we, upon the whole, have the advantages of greater growth from resources more deeply laid and richer and wider than any other country, still we are only advancing at the head of the procession along with the rest of the world, which is made better by a happier appreciation of the beautiful abundance of the earth, if we care for it as rational creatures should, and for the rights of men, and that they may know their duty to defend, preserve, cultivate, and enjoy the fruits of the earth and the fulness thereof. Estimating our national attitude and the dues and hopes of our country by these standards, it becomes us to part with so much of our conceits as may belong to the theory that we alone have an inheritance of enduring riches and abounding righteousness.

We should be contented to be the greatest and happiest of the nations, and find out before it is too late, without other tumults and wars, that there is no people so mighty that they can be unjust with safety, no fault worse than wastefulness of the substance of the earth we inherit, and no crime so perilous as to wrong the poor.

MURAT HALSTEAD.

THE CORROBORATION OF PROFESSOR HUXLEY.

BY JOHN BURROUGHS.

Dr. Lyman Abbott, in criticising Professor Huxley in a recent number of this Review, loses sight of a very important distinction—a distinction which Professor Huxley keeps constantly before him in the articles referred to; namely, the distinction between objective and subjective truth, between a statement or a proposition which rests upon outward, independent, logical evidence, and is addressed to the reason and the understanding, and one which is purely personal and subjective, involving the taste, the emotions, the hopes, the aspirations, and which is true or false according to the temper and experience of the person to whom it is addressed. When our theological doctors talk of the evidences of Christianity, they lay great stress upon the historical evidences; the root of the matter is here; these are real, objective, positive, and are matters of logical and scientific inquiry. The subjective evidences—that is, those which are furnished by the mental or spiritual experience of the individual and beget a feeling of certainty and security in his mind,—these are of quite a different nature, and our logical faculties can have little to do with them.

Professor Huxley, in his *Nineteenth Century* articles referred to, applies the scientific method of inquiry to certain alleged occurrences in the New Testament—occurrences which must rest upon objective evidence, if upon any, and in which the appeal of credibility is made, not to our faculty of spiritual insight, but to our reason and understanding. Is the story of the Gadarene swine probable? is it reasonable? does it agree with the rest of our knowledge? "The Gadarene miracle either happened, or it did not. Whether the Gadarene 'question' is moral or religious, or not, has nothing to do with the fact that it is a purely historical question whether the demons said what they are declared to have said,

and the devil-possessed pigs did or did not rush over the cliffs of the Lake of Gennesaret on a certain day of a certain year," etc. "If that is not a matter about which evidence ought to be required, and not only legal but strict scientific proof demanded by sane men who are asked to believe the story—what is it?" Professor Huxley thinks a man who believes such a story without logical evidence is guilty of an immoral act. And so generally with the miracles recorded in the New Testament, and with demonology and possessions. These things are alleged occurrences in the outward physical world, and they are not supported by adequate objective evidence.

Men reason upon the subject of the soul's immortality, but the answer which reason gives is mainly in the negative. There is nothing that could be called evidence that man continues to live after the dissolution of his body. Yet Dr. Abbott is convinced that he does so exist; he realizes in himself "a nature superior to disease, decay, mortality"; and who shall gainsay him? who shall say he is illogical? The evidence he has upon this point is personal and subjective, and cannot be imparted to another. It has no logical or scientific validity, because it begins and ends with himself. It is not a question of reason, but of religious conviction. But all the questions in dispute between Professor Huxley and Dr. Wace are questions of reason and of evidence. They pertain to the outward, visible, concrete world of history and of experience, and can be settled in no court but the court of reason.

Dr. Abbott says (and he assumes to speak for "the great mass of Christian believers") "that there are propositions which men ought to believe without logically-satisfying evidence." This is what the old Mother Church used to say, and used to back it up with the stake and the rack. "Ought to believe"; that is, it is a man's duty to believe certain propositions addressed to his rational faculties, without rationally-satisfying evidence. It is to be regretted that the good doctor did not cite some theological or religious proposition, or some article from the creeds, that it is a man's duty thus to believe. Would he say that a man ought to believe any of the points in dispute between Professor Huxley and Dr. Wace without "logically-satisfying evidence"?—the swine story, the authorship of the Gospels, that Jesus said what he is reported to have said, that demonology is true, etc., etc.?

Professor Huxley, I imagine, would be the last man in the world to deny Dr. Abbott's proposition that there is such a thing as spiritual insight, or the religious sense, and that certainties, or at least assurances and satisfaction, reach the soul through these avenues. The religious nature or the poetic and artistic nature is not occupied with logical processes or the reasons of things, but with impressions, attractions, intuitions, emotional processes, the divine, the beautiful, the enjoyable. We do not ask of a poem, or a work of art, or any work of pure literature, Is it true? as we would ask of a proposition of science, or the statement of a witness upon the stand, or the declaration of a creed, Is it true? but, Is it good? is it powerful? is it satisfying? does it move and nourish us? A poem must have poetic truth, but how different is this from mathematical or scientific truth, and by what different faculties apprehended! Neither do we ask of purely religious utterances like the Sermon on the Mount or Paul's Epistles, Are they true? but, Do they stimulate and exalt our religious sense? do they quicken and purify the spirit? Paul's theology may be true or false: what is forever true and real is his fervid piety, his spiritual power, his eloquent humility, and his love for mankind. His logical faculties may have been weak; the things which he believed, which lay in his understanding and satisfied his reason, may have been utterly inadequate to stand rigid tests, but for all that the power and value of his writings are beyond question. The same may be said of some of the fathers of the church, weak in reason, but strong in the spirit. Professor Huxley is strong in reason; his logic is a chain hard to break; but highly spiritual and imaginative natures would, perhaps, find little satisfaction in his writings. He is occupied with objective truth, not with subjective impressions. His mind is strictly scientific, and the results of his method of inquiry are hard to controvert.

He does not deny the moral sense, or the æsthetic sense, or the religious sense, as Dr. Abbott would seem to imply; he is not discussing questions that lie in either of these realms, but questions that come within the scope of reason and are matters of evidence. The questions of right and wrong in human conduct, of lying, of stealing, of murder, etc., which Dr. Abbott introduces, belong to quite a different sphere from the question of the authorship of the Gospels or of the credibility of the miracles.

There is the appeal to conscience, the appeal to taste, the appeal to our sense of the fitness of things, and there is also the appeal to reason, to the judgment, to our power to weigh and sift evidence. It seems to me that Dr. Abbott confounds these things, and in his reply to Huxley sets up a man of straw. If the great scientist had said that all truth and certainty come through the logical faculties, he would have laid himself open to the doctor's criticism. What he did say or imply was that all scientific, all objective, truth comes through our logical faculties. These are his words: "It is wrong for a man to say that he is certain of the objective truth of any proposition unless he can produce evidence which logically justifies that certainty."

In the outward objective world a fact is always a fact. It is always pertinent to inquire into the truth of any alleged occurrence. St. Augustine says that the flesh of the peacock never decays. Is this a fact? If it was a fact in his day, it must be a fact in ours. Do miracles happen? have they ever happened? Is there a personal devil? Are we surrounded by a multitude of good and bad spirits who are seeking to influence our lives? Any objective evidence of the truth and reality of these things must hold good at all times and in all places. Two and two always make four, and doubtless always will. But when we enter the region of morals, we are in a world where all is plastic, indefinite, relative. Right and wrong are so only under certain conditions. It may be right to lie and steal and murder under certain extraordinary circumstances. "The certainties of the moral and spiritual realm" to which Dr. Abbott refers, and upon which he says "all æsthetic, all domestic, all political and national life are based," are not outward demonstrable certainties, like those of science, but inward personal certainties, which involve our constitution and our temporary relations to the universe and to each other.

Dr. Abbott says he feels but a lanquid interest in the critical discussion as to the authorship of the four Gospels. This may well be. It may be because Dr. Abbott is not primarily interested in questions of evidence, or in logical and reasoning processes. He is a moralist and preacher, and seeks the springs of conduct, not the sources of logical conviction. I believe he accepts the doctrine of demoniacal possession; it seems to suit his emotional and imaginative type of mind. But a man of science, as such, could

no more accept such an explanation of any form of insanity than he could attribute crystallization to the work of fairies or the wind and the storm to furies. The authorship of the four Gospels may not be a vital question to the religious mind, but, as a question, it is a matter of evidence, and not at all of personal impression.

If Christianity really rested upon evidence, if its vitality was solely dependent upon verifiable facts and considerations, like a work of science, it would have perished from the earth long ago. But it does not live by its so-called evidences. Christianity is largely a matter of the heart, of the feelings and the emotions. It has not rested upon logical evidences; its main hold in the first instance has not been upon men's scientific faculties, but upon their hopes, fears, aspirations, and spiritual cravings. Paul says: "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost." Neither can he. To talk about the reasonableness of Christianity is like talking about the reasonableness of magic or witchcraft. The human faculties are utterly powerless before its main tenets. Christianity has the vitality of literature, of poetry and art. The Gospel records have wonderful, even magical, power as literature. They are true, not as history, but as poetry.

The myth of the resurrection will be kept alive for ages to come, notwithstanding all that has been or can be urged against it, because mankind have such a profound interest in believing it.

Christianity does not offer a system of philosophy, but a religious incentive. When it attempts to play the rôle of interpreter of the visible order of the universe, or to satisfy our rational faculties, its failure is pathetic; its proofs are childish; its science is essentially pagan; its story of the fall as an explanation of the origin of evil, and its "plan of salvation" as a means of escape from that evil, as science, do not rise above any of the delusions of the pagan world. The story of the Chaldee god, Bel, who cut off his own head, moistened the clay with his blood, and then made man out of it, is just as rational an explanation of the origin of man as the one the Christian Church has always adhered to. In fact, the whole basis of our theology, the conception of Jesus as a supernatural person who had no earthly father, and who rose from the dead and ascended bodily up into heaven, etc., is essentially pagan, and belongs to an order of things that has long since passed away. The power of Christian-

ity is a spiritual power; it is in its appeals to the ideal of the gentle, the merciful, the meek, the forgiving, the pure in heart —an ideal which has such an attraction for the European nations; and also to the love of reward and the fear of punishment which materialistic ages foster. In one is its charm for fine natures; in the other its power over the multitude.

Theological writers are in general prone to magnify subjective certitude at the expense of objective proof; to place faith above reason, in the domain of reason. They sneer at science and logic as if in their sphere they could be dispensed with and something else be substituted in their place. Thus Professor Blackie, in that vituperative book of his, "The Natural History of Atheism,"—a book the style of which is like a man going through a house and banging the doors behind him,—says, as a finishing stroke to the "drivel" of our "boastful science," that the "highest cognitions are never reached by the mere exercise of the knowing faculties, on whatever subject exercised." Not even, I suppose, when exercised upon the multiplication-table! "Instinct and aspiration," he goes on to say, "are higher than knowledge; and the pretensions of the merely scientific man to assume the dictatorship of things that be are not founded on nature. Many things can be known only by being felt; all vital forces are fundamentally unknowable; but they exist not the less because would-be philosopher B or would-be philosopher C has no machinery with which to measure or control them." Are instinct and aspiration "cognitions"? Do they belong to the sphere of knowledge? Do they even point to any certain and demonstrable conclusions? They may or they may not be higher than knowledge; it is certain that they cannot take the place of knowledge. Instinct and aspiration enlightened by knowledge is the desirable order, is it not? The only thing the scientific man assumes is that the scientific method is the only proper one with which to deal with the objective world of fact and experience. If the professor meant to say that some things are to be felt and not known, he is near the truth. The facts of science are to be known; we may know Kepler's laws; we can hardly feel them, since they are not personal. But truths of art, of poetry, of religion, are to be felt, whether we know them or not. They come to us by a synthetical, not by an analytical, process.

I have no disposition to overrate our mere knowing faculties; I only want to say that what we *know* we know through them.

What we feel, or fancy, or hope forms no part of our true knowledge, and may come through other avenues. The perception of the beautiful is not a part of our knowledge; neither is the perception of the moral or the spiritual. These things are from within; they are subjective and not objective, and not within the range of the scientific faculties. They are real, just as pleasure and pain are real; they are experiences of the mind. The whole sphere of religion lies here; the kingdom of heaven is within you, not in some outward relation or condition.

Neither do I not wish to imply that there is any feud between science and true religion, between that part of man's nature which thirsts for exact knowledge—the red rays of the spectrum, so to speak—and that part of his nature which we call the spiritual, and which fades off into the vast unknown—the violet rays, at the other extreme ; nor between either of these and his æsthetic nature, his love of beautiful forms, though in different individuals these different parts will not be equally developed, nor will they be equally active in different races and times. The feud is between true science and false science ; between the conception of an order that is rational and one that is irrational, between modern pathology and Indian "medicine."

Exact science deals with and can only deal with the objective, the rigid, inexorable world of law. With the subjective, the world within us, the world of personality, whence comes all we call literature, art, religion, philosophy, etc., it cannot deal. Here exact demonstration is not possible; all is plastic, growing, conflicting, aspiring, indeterminate. The personal element modifies everything. The laws by which insensate bodies act and react upon each other may be determined, but the laws by which persons act and react upon each other are quite another matter. In the subjective world truth is relative, but in the world of science truth is absolute. Chemical elements always combine in the same proportions; moisture is always precipitated from the air under the same conditions; the operations of physical nature are uniform; given the same conditions, and the same results always follow. Doubtless the same results always follow the same conditions in the world of mind and personality also, but here the conditions are more obscure and more fluctuating, and science cannot grasp them.

Every original mind may have, and usually does have, a phi-

losophy of its own, a religion of its own, a political creed of its own, literary preferences of its own; but every mind cannot have a science of its own. The personal element is alien to science. How many systems of philosophies have there been from Aristotle down to Spencer? How many times have the old problems been explained? But one man's science must be another man's science; all science is a whole—a pushing farther and farther of the lines of knowledge into nature.

The hostility between the scientific and the spiritual, or the truly religious, may well cease, if, indeed, there ever has been, or ever can be, real hostility. We are bound to give the reason and the understanding full sway in their own proper fields. In subduing and in utilizing this world, or adjusting ourselves to it, we have no guide but science. Yet science is not the main part of life, notwithstanding all the noise it is making in the world. Science is making a great noise in the world because it is doing a great work. Literature, art, religion, speculation, have had their day; that is, the highest achievements of which they are capable are undoubtedly of the past. But science is young; it is now probably only in the heat of its forenoon work. It is a little curious that man's knowing faculties, the first to be appealed to, should be the latest in maturing; that he should worship so profoundly, admire so justly, act so wisely and heroically, while he yet knew so little accurately of the world in which he was placed. Does not this fact point to the conclusion that science is not the main part of life? It is probably the main part of our material civilization, of that by which we are clothed and fed and warmed and transported, defended in war and housed in peace; but of an intrinsic civilization it forms a less part. The old Greek had little or no material civilization in the modern sense; his civilization was personal and mental. What distinguishes the modern man is not his personal superiority, but the enormous engines and deft appliances with which he is fended and armed, and the greatness of his material triumphs.

Yet knowledge is not discredited, reason is not supplanted. We can no more dispense with them than we can dispense with the bones in our bodies. They furnish the framework by which our lives are upheld. All the certainty we have of the order of the objective world comes through our rational faculties.

The Agnostic does not merely say that all knowledge is imperfect and fragmentary, nor that all certainty is based on the logical faculty; but simply that the understanding goes upon evidence; that in this world we have no guide to objective truth but our rational faculties. He finds no room for what our religious brethren call faith, because faith, as commonly understood, is a fatal undertow that swamps and drowns reason. He finds many things and enjoys many things which he cannot understand; he is not a stranger to the thrill of awe and reverence in the presence of the great mystery of the universe; but all propositions relative to the plans, ways, and nature of that mystery that are not verifiable, he fights shy of.

JOHN BURROUGHS.

ARE TELEGRAPH RATES TOO HIGH?

BY NORVIN GREEN, PRESIDENT OF THE WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

A GENERAL discussion of telegraph rates, both in the newspapers and in business circles, seems to have been provoked by a recent official correspondence in respect to the rates to be paid on government messages. Nearly every newspaper throughout the country has had something to say on the subject. Many, without rhyme or reason, have denounced existing rates as exorbitant, while many others, better informed, evidently realize that it does cost something to construct and equip telegraph lines and to maintain and operate them.

Rates for telegraph service are necessarily predicated on the cost of the plant and on the current expenses of maintaining and operating the lines. No telegraph system would be maintained and operated as a private enterprise except at rates that would yield revenues sufficiently above the cost of maintenance and operation to pay a reasonable remuneration on the capital employed.

CAPITAL INVESTED.

And here we encounter the frequently reiterated outcry of dividends on watered stock—a clamor that could be more justly and more reasonably applied to any of the large railroad companies, whose lines extend to the great metropolis, than to the principal telegraph company of this country.

Within the last twenty-four years, and since that company has been domiciled at the city of New York, more than twenty-five million dollars of its cash earnings, and the proceeds of six million three hundred and fifty thousand dollars of bonds, making nearly thirty-one and a half millions in cash, have been expended in the construction and extension of its lines and in the purchase

of additional telegraph properties; and during the same period twenty-eight million four hundred thousand dollars of its capital stock have been paid for the purchase of the various telegraph companies it has absorbed. Sixty-one and a half millions have been expended in the growth and extension of its system since 1866, in addition to the forty-one millions of capitalization at that date. Its leased properties, including its trans-Atlantic and Gulf cables, represent about twenty-five millions more. With the other and smaller systems of telegraph added, it is safe to say that one hundred and forty millions of dollars have been invested in telegraph properties in this country.

Some of the lines paid for in capital stock were purchased at prices somewhat above the cost of their construction; while against that, over thirty-one millions of cash expended in the construction of lines under railroad contracts, with the assistance of free transportation and labor, would have cost 50 per cent. more but for these advantages. The surplus of these investments, unrepresented by any form of capitalization, is now about ten and one-half millions,—more than sufficient to counterbalance the alleged inflations in the early years of the history of telegraph companies. The capitalization as it now stands is not above the cost value of the company's properties, while a distinguished advocate of a government telegraph has repeatedly asserted that he considered the contracts of the company of greater value than its properties.

Very few of the original telegraph companies earned any dividends for the stockholders. Most of them did not earn expenses of maintenance and operation for a number of years; and the original investment in most of them proved a partial, if not a total, loss. Although the average rates for the service were then four times as large as they are now, it was thus early demonstrated that, unless the companies could command business enough to employ the operators, they could not earn expenses. The cost to the companies of transmitting and delivering messages, especially for long distances, was then more than three times as great as it is at this date; partly for want of efficient machinery now in use, partly because there was not sufficient business to keep the operators constantly employed, and more largely for the reason that messages sent long distances had to pass over the lines of three or four, and sometimes of six or seven, different companies, by

each of which they were registered and retransmitted, causing not only a very expensive, but a very tardy, service as compared with that which is now rendered.

COST OF MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION.

The gross revenues of the principal telegraph company for the last fiscal year reported (see annual report, October 10, 1888) were $19,711,164.12. The total expenses were $14,640,592.18, being a fraction over 74 per cent. of the gross revenues. But a part of the revenues and a portion of the expenses did not pertain to the transmission and delivery of messages on the land lines, nor to the tolls derived therefrom. Eliminate from the revenues that which was derived from dividends on stocks in other companies, from the rent of private wires, from tolls over Atlantic and Cuba cables, and from premiums on money-order transfers, and the remainder, strictly the earnings for transmission of messages over the land lines, yielded an average of $31\frac{2}{10}$ cents a message on 51,463,955 messages transmitted, counting press reports at thirty words to the message. In like manner, deducting from the expenses the cost of maintaining and operating the Atlantic and Cuba cables, and the rentals paid for those cables, the estimated cost of maintaining private wires leased, including the "ticker" service, and the remaining expenses, strictly pertaining to the cost of maintenance and the operation of lines employed in the transmission of messages, show an average cost to the company of $23\frac{2}{10}$ cents per message on the number of messages transmitted, as before stated; the actual cost being a fraction over 75 per cent. of the tolls charged for the service.

There is no means of ascertaining the average cost of handling messages prior to the consolidation of all, or nearly all, the telegraph companies in 1866 and 1867. But for the year ending June 30, 1868, the average cost to the company of handling 6,404,595 messages was $63\frac{4}{10}$ cents per message, and the average tolls for transmission were $\$1.04\frac{7}{10}$ per message. With the rapid increase of business, both the cost to the company of handling messages and the tolls charged to the public have been steadily reduced year by year, until in the year 1887–'88 the average tolls per message were $31\frac{2}{10}$ cents, being less than one-half of what it cost the company to handle a message in 1868.

Among the items that enter into the cost of handling 51,463,955 messages are salaries paid to operators, clerks, managers, and officials, $6,271,339.71—being a fraction over 13 cents per message; the cost of maintaining the lines, embraced in the items of superintendents, reconstruction, and repairs, $2,235,614.08—being about 4⅜ cents per message; messenger service, a little over $1,000,000—being about 2 cents per message. Thus we have in three general items—maintenance, operation, and delivery—a cost of 19⅜ cents per message handled. In addition to these are the rentals of offices, light and fuel, office repairs and furniture, instruments, battery material, taxes, legal expenses, and miscellaneous items, making up the remainder of the aggregate cost of 23$\frac{2}{10}$ cents per message.

It will be seen that more than half the entire cost of telegraph service, over thirteen cents per message, is in salaries paid managers, operators, and clerks; and this notwithstanding more than three-fourths of all the offices, embracing nearly all the small offices, are operated at no direct cost in money payment for salaries, under provisions of railroad contracts.

The cost of operating service is much below the average on trunk lines where but two operators are employed—one to send and the other to receive messages—and where the business is large enough to keep the operators constantly employed, as between New York and Boston, New York and Philadelphia, New York and Washington or Baltimore, and between New York and Buffalo. And yet a large number of messages are sent between the branch offices in different cities, doubling and tripling the work, as from a branch office in New York to a branch office in Boston, involving their transmission first from the branch office to the main office in New York, thence to the main office in Boston, thence to the branch office, employing six operators to handle the message, instead of two operators if it were sent between two offices only. Many of the branch offices, of which there are over one hundred and fifty in New York alone, do not have business enough to employ the operator one-fourth of his time, and at most of the medium-sized offices more operators have to be kept than the business will employ all day, because of the press of business in the three or four active business hours of the day.

There was a halt in the steady reduction of the cost of handling messages, and in the rates for their transmission, from 1878

to 1884. This was because of the great effort to improve the service and meet the growing exactions of the commercial public. These increasing demands of commercial customers for prompt transmission have thrown the great bulk of the service into about four hours of the business day, requiring a constant increase of wire facilities and of the number of operators to give a satisfactory service; and demonstrate that a good telegraph service is necessarily much more expensive than a poor service.

An erroneous impression is prevalent that distance is not a very material factor in the cost of telegraph service. The ordinary telegraph circuit that can be relied on for constant working is about five hundred miles. Messages are sent one thousand, fifteen hundred, two thousand, and even twenty-five hundred miles with one direct writing, but over a compound circuit through repeaters about every five hundred miles, at each of which new battery force is supplied; and, though they are called automatic repeaters, it requires the service of a first-class operator at each repeater to keep it in adjustment; so that on a direct circuit of five hundred miles but two operators are employed, while a circuit of a thousand miles through repeaters employs three operators; one of fifteen hundred miles requires four; one of two thousand miles five; and one of twenty-five hundred miles (as is nearly constantly worked from Chicago to San Francisco) employs six operators. The principal items of cost being maintenance and operation, it may be plainly seen that to transmit a message fifteen hundred miles involves twice the cost of transmitting one five hundred miles for operators and three times the cost for maintenance. A message transmitted twenty-five hundred miles costs three times as much for operating service and five times as much for maintenance as one over a single circuit of five hundred miles or less. A large amount of business is done between the Atlantic seaboard cities and the Pacific coast, the distances ranging from thirty-five hundred miles to forty-five hundred miles. The cost of maintenance is estimated as proportionate to the mileage of wire; but in fact the cost of maintenance is materially greater per mile of wire on the lines crossing the mountain ranges and where there are few wires on the poles.

Having demonstrated the cost of telegraph service, and that it is more than 75 per cent. of the rates charged to the public, the profit out of which interest on bonded debt has to be paid does

not appear to be exorbitant; nor does it appear that a further reduction of rates could be reasonably demanded until the increase of business shall have brought about a reduction in the cost of the service. There are few other large corporations that could pay interest on their bonded debt and other fixed charges out of such meagre profits, and have anything left for their stockholders.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER COUNTRIES.

In every country of Europe the government owns and operates the telegraph. A few of the longer submarine cables are owned and controlled by private corporations; but private enterprise has long been prohibited from owning or operating any land system of telegraph. There is, therefore, no recognized responsibility to the customer for errors or delays, and little or no satisfaction afforded in answers to complaints. A sort of stereotyped form of acknowledgment is, substantially, that the matter will be inquired into, and if there be found cause of complaint the employees at fault will be disciplined. That is supposed to end the correspondence, and the complainant never gets any redress or any further information in regard to the erroneous transmission or miscarriage of his message.

Most of the governments find it necessary to control the telegraph for the very reason that its control by the government in this country has been opposed—namely, to protect the government from the people. In this country it has not been found desirable to strengthen the government against the untrammelled lawful will of the people. It is probable that very cheap rates for telegraph service are given to the public to reconcile the people to this enormous engine of power and espionage in the hands of the government. The rates within the comparatively narrow limits of any one of these countries for short distances, rarely exceeding five hundred miles, are generally somewhat lower than they are in the United States. But between any two or more of these government systems the rates are much higher than in this country, while the service is incomparably worse. Every one who has travelled in Europe will testify to that. With rare exceptions their telegraph service is provokingly unsatisfactory. Even between two such prominent commercial centres as London and Paris the service is so unreliable in point of time that some large commercial houses, when they want their messages to go

promptly, send from London to Paris by way of New York over the trans-Atlantic cables.

In an article published in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW in November, 1883, the views of an experienced news-gatherer, in regard to the comparative merits of the telegraph service in Europe and America, were given in detail and at some length, showing a state of facts which, according to the experience of those who succeeded him in the extensive use of European telegraphs, still exists. The following extract gives the summing-up of his conclusions tersely and pointedly:

"It has been forced upon my conviction by twelve years of intimate acquaintance with the business in America and six years of continuous experience in the same business in Europe that the average time of transmission on the Western Union lines is shorter than on any system in Europe or in any country of Europe; and that the number of errors made by American operators is much smaller than by European operators; and in these respects and all others connected with the principal part of the telegraph service the private companies have made steady and continuous improvement, while the tendency in Europe is to stagnate or retrograde."

This is simply what one would expect as the contrast between government management and private enterprise in a business requiring the most energetic and watchful diligence in all its departments, from the clerk who receives the message at the window to the messenger boy who delivers it at its destination. The management of these systems, like most government management, is cumbersome. A superabundance of officials, clerks, and employees, with the most punctilious observance of rank and gradation; not a few holding their positions by political or family influence, being notoriously incompetent, so that whatever falls to their lot is, of course, badly done. Such encumbrances appear to be a necessary part of the machinery of all departments of government, whether European or American.

Whether from these reasons or the low rates of tolls, or both combined, it is a well-known fact that all government telegraph systems are operated at a loss. In some instances the accounts are so blended with those of other departments of the government that the precise measure of loss cannot be readily demonstrated; but it is not claimed by any government that its telegraph system pays expenses. In Great Britain, however, the accounts are kept more distinct, and the annual statements, showing the gross receipts, expenditures, interest on debt, and deficit of the telegraph department, are incorporated in the annual report of the

Postmaster-General. With these statements widely copied in the newspapers, the writer has been astonished to find in the columns of so well-informed a journal as the Boston *Globe*, on September 18, 1889, in an article headed "The Telegraphs of Two Countries," the following statement:

"The British government makes a profit on these low rates, too. The telegraph service not only pays all its own expenses, but yields annually to the treasury a surplus of over £4,000,000, or $20,000,000."

The last report of the British Postmaster-General that has reached this country is for the fiscal year 1887–'88. A tabular statement, showing the earnings, expenses, and interest on bonds of the telegraph department is given on page 9 of that report, which shows that the telegraph department never did earn any considerable part of the 3 per cent. interest on the bonds given for the purchase and extension of the telegraph, and that since the reduction of the rate in 1884 it has earned no part of that interest; and although the other departments of the government pay full rates for their telegraph service, the earnings have not been equal to current expenses. Leaving out the interest on bonds, the expenses for the last five years stated were more than £160,000 ($800,000) in excess of the revenues.

Another marked contrast between the American and European systems is the basis on which tolls are charged. On all the European systems the rate charged is per word with a minimum number of words, generally twenty, for which minimum the customer has to pay, though the actual number may be less. In England, however, in about 1885, the rate was reduced from a shilling for twenty words or less to sixpence for twelve words or less, and a half-penny for each additional word, all the words, including address and signature, being counted. In this country only the body-words of the message are counted, the minimum of body-words being ten or less, the date, address, and signature being free. The reason of that distinction is that in this country full addresses are courted to facilitate delivery.

The rate in Great Britain is lower than that of any of the systems in Europe, except that of Belgium, and a message of twenty words by the English count is generally one-fifth lower for like distances in this country than our ten-body-word message, which, including address and signature, generally contains twenty words or more. But not uniformly so. There are frequent instances

of messages with long address, such as "C. P. Huntington, Vice-President and General Manager, 263 Park Avenue, New York City," and long signatures, such as "Samuel F. G. Johnson, Assistant General Passenger Agent," which, if charged for at the British rate of one cent a word for all the words, would make the message amount to at least thirty-two cents at the British rate, instead of twenty-five cents for the ten body-words, with address and signature free, as charged in this country. In this instance there are twenty-two words in the address and signature, and such instances are not infrequent.

But while the European rates are, in most instances, lower for short distances, they are immensely higher for long distances. The rate of forty cents carries the ordinary message from New York, Philadelphia, Washington, or Baltimore to Chicago or St. Louis—a distance of one thousand miles and over; while nowhere in Europe (except between Paris and Algiers over the French Government cable) can the same message be sent that distance for less than twice the amount charged in this country. Messages from Chicago or St. Louis to San Francisco and other points on the Pacific coast, distant from twenty-five hundred to three thousand miles, are transmitted for seventy-five cents, while nowhere in Europe can the same message be sent a like distance for less than four times the tolls charged in this country. Even for the shorter distances, where the message is between two or more systems, the European rates are very much higher than those of this country. For the maximum rate of one dollar, a message may be transmitted between the most distant points at which there are telegraph offices in the United States, the extreme distance being something over four thousand miles.

A message between any two points in different countries of Europe, involving a charge of the rates of both countries, however short the distance, makes a much higher rate of tolls than that charged in this country for a like distance. A twenty-word message by the European count is generally about equal in length to our minimum of ten body-words, with ten additional words for date, address, and signature. Such a message from London to Brussels, Paris, Amsterdam, Lyons, Strassburg, or Frankfort (the distances being from two hundred to four hundred miles) would be eighty cents, while from New York to Boston, Washington, Buffalo, Pittsburg, Portland, Me., Concord, N. H., or

Burlington, Vt. (the same range of distances), the rate is twenty-five cents. From London to Venice, Barcelona, Copenhagen, Vienna, Rome, or Madrid (the distances being from six hundred to nine hundred miles) the rate for such message is one dollar and eighty cents, while from New York to Cincinnati, Louisville, Indianapolis, Chicago, and St. Louis (the distances being from six hundred to one thousand miles) the rate for such message is forty cents. From London to St. Petersburg (twelve hundred miles) the rate is thirteen cents per word—two dollars and sixty cents; while from New York to St. Paul, Omaha, and leading points in Kansas and Nebraska (distances ranging from twelve hundred to fourteen hundred miles) the rate is fifty cents.

And why should not the rates in the old countries of Europe be lower than in this country? The systems are more compact, the population is more dense, and the lines are located mostly in an open country, requiring less expense for repairs and maintenance. The chief item of the cost of telegraph service is the pay of operators, which in those countries is less than one-half of that paid for operators in this country, while the business is concentrated in a smaller area and on shorter lines. Take, for instance, the British system as compared with that of this country—a system embracing 30,255 miles of line, 178,962 miles of wire, and 6,810 offices, and covering an area of about 129,000 square miles. That system transmitted, during the year 1887–'88, 53,403,429 messages; while over the principal system in this country, covering an area of 3,000,000 square miles, nearly twenty-five times as great, embracing 171,375 miles of line, 616,248 miles of wire, and 17,241 offices, mostly in a sparsely-settled and wooded country, there were transmitted 51,463,955 messages. To do a smaller amount of business by nearly two millions of messages there had to be maintained in this country more than five and one-half times as many miles of line, three and one-half times as many miles of wire, and nearly three times as many offices. With less than one-fifth of the mileage of lines, less than one-third the amount of wire, and with a little over one-third the number of offices, covering one-twenty-fifth part of the area, with cheaper wire, cheaper instruments, and cheaper battery and stationery supplies, and lower-priced labor, the repairs, maintenance, equipment, and supplies on the British system could scarcely cost one-fourth as much as on the larger system in this country. The

salaries of operators, messengers, and office employees being less than one-half the rates paid in this country for like service, it should not cost more than half as much to transmit and deliver messages in Great Britain as in the United States, especially taking account of another great item of saving—the larger amount of business concentrated in a smaller territory on fewer and shorter wires, giving constant employment to the operators. These items of maintenance, supplies, operation, and delivery of messages comprise more than four-fifths of the cost of the service.

The following comparative statement will show the relative cost of operators in London and New York :

Average Salaries paid to Telegraph Operators by the English Post-Office Department, at London (Central Station), in the year 1887-'88.

1,224 Males,	at monthly pay aggregating	$34,596.52
719 Females,	" " " "	17.104.32
1,943 Total,	" " " "	$51,700.84

The average being

Males	$28.26 per month.
Females	23.76 " "
Males and females	26.60 " "

Average Salaries paid to Telegraph Operators by the Western Union Telegraph Company, at the Main Office, in New York, in the month of December, 1887.

471 Males,	at monthly pay aggregating	$33,705
193 Females,	" " " "	7,095
664 Total,	" " " "	$40,800

The average being

Males	$71.56 per month.
Females	36.75 " "
Males and females	61.45 " "

It is difficult to appreciate the magnitude of the telegraph systems in the United States. Combined, they are more than one-third the entire telegraph systems in the world in mileage of lines and wires and number of offices maintained, and more than that of any ten other countries contiguous to each other. About six hundred and seventy-five thousand miles of telegraph wire are being operated in the United States,—sufficient to girdle the earth twenty-seven times. To expect this vast system, covering an area of three millions of square miles, in great part over rough and sparsely-settled territory, to be maintained and operated (at a cost for operators and linemen of more than double the rate of salaries paid in any country of Europe) at the same rates of tolls, without regard to territory, that are paid in the smaller countries of Europe, is unreasonable and unjust.

NORVIN GREEN.

THE FUTURE OF FICTION.

BY EDGAR SALTUS.

It seems but yesterday that the novelist succeeded the troubadour. It was the duty of the latter to amuse, to beguile an idle hour, to compliment and to please. But with the passing of the fantasist it has been discovered that the art of pleasing is the secret of mediocrity, that the scalpel is more useful than the lute. And as the old order changes, song and story change as well. Their mission is no longer to please; it is to cure.

To Madame de Châteauroux—and to any one else, perhaps, who happened that way—the fifteenth Louis of France was accustomed to assert that an attempt to overdress human nature was nothing less than high treason. This quip has since fossilized into an axiom. If in other countries, our own for instance, it has not taken root, may it not be that the soil is at fault? They have truffles in Périgord; there are none in Westchester. But there is a better explanation: we are succeeding in an attempt to complete a civilization which shall be distinctively our own. This effort, which, despite details that jar, is grandly manifest in the political, commercial, and social aspects of the hour, is yet in certain departments of literature, in fiction principally, still stumbling in unlighted paths. Now, fiction is in no sense the trivial thing which it is popularly considered. It is an educational factor of peculiar importance, one whose influence may be salutary or the reverse; moreover, it is the complement of a nation's annals, that insight into daily life which the ancient monarchies neglected to prepare for us, and through which neglect the volumes that treat of past grandeurs and decadence are handsomely bound and never read. In view, then, of the progressive tendencies of the hour, it is curious to probe the defection in this unique respect.

In this connection it will seem trite to say that no one begins to fresco a wall before the house is roofed; homespun must precede satin; utility, grace: as a nation we have been so fully occupied in attending to foundations that the need of festoons and astrogals has kept very few people awake. Those whom it has tormented have, generally speaking, been travellers from other shores. They have declared that we are lacking in traditions and ignorant of art. With the traditions we can dispense, at least for the present. Time, in which all things unroll, will fill that gap unprompted. But with art it is different. From whatever stand-point it may be considered, art, in its essence, is a theory; a corner of the universe, some one has said, interpreted by a temperament. With its trans-Atlantic achievements every one is more or less familiar. Impresarii bring with them applauded scores; the masterpieces of foreign painters we have usually a chance to examine. Yet in either case the theories that presided at their parturitions remain remote. The accusation, then, of the casual traveller is not without foundation. We are ignorant of art precisely as we are ignorant of truffles. We appreciate, we consume, but we do not produce. This defect, like that of the absence of traditions, Time, it is not utopian to suppose, will one day efface; we will have theories of our own and astonish the world with our conceptions. Yet that which in regard to music and the brush lends excuse to our present lack of enterprise is the fact, already noted, that Europe sends its masterpieces by express. Barring the question of national glory, we have no absolute need of composers and painters of native birth; we can enjoy Wagner without understanding a word of German, and a picture signed Millet may be admired without the interpreter's aid.

In regard to literature, however, and particularly in regard to fiction, it is permissible to strum a different guitar. We have the liberty no doubt, if we wish it, to digest English novels, but as a matter of fact we don't. Save in exceptions rare, yet happily existing, we leave them to the housemaid and the spider. The British author of to-day, as is the case with his German and his Italian brother, exists on the very thing we lack—traditions. He can, and does, with pardonable pride refer you to writers Who Came Before. When our country becomes as old as his, we can, and doubtless will, be able to do very much the same thing; but

meanwhile we cannot delight ourselves with the other existing schools of fiction, the French and the Russian, for there is the Tower of Babel looming its inhibition at the very wish. The scores and paintings which Europeans produce may continue yet awhile to pleasure both ear and eye, but as for fiction translated, it is like a pressed flower—the charm, the aroma and life, have gone.

It may not, then, be impertinent to the purpose of this paper to assert that such fiction as we happen to have, while admirable in many respects, is native only in that the coloring has more or less of a local tint. Eliminate that tint, give it another, and the characteristics differ not at all from those to which the English novelist has accustomed us; they perfectly express a relative impression of What Should Be and What Should Not; they rarely express What Is. In the home manufacture the action may be a trifle more rapid; in the last chapter there may be fewer births and obituaries and a finer regard for the reader's privilege to take this and that for granted; but in the main the model is the same, and it is of this model that the public is getting weary. What it wants is something else. Less of the magic lantern, perhaps, and more of life; not that particular phase which ought to be and is not, but life in its pettiness and occasional splendor, and displayed, too, with so little ink that at the last page the reader may murmur, "I would recognize those people on sight." In view, however, of certain conditions of thought, an attempt of this kind is less easy than might be supposed.

To give a novel that interest which shall differentiate it from a disquisition, a plot is necessary. In that plot there may be a murder, a forgery, some misadventure, the loot of an illusion—all of these elements, if need be, and more of the same kind; but there must be love, and therein lies the difficulty. The murder may be committed in circumstances of such atrocity that the reader will scream with fright; the forms of villany exposed in the forgery or in the misadventure may rival anything in the Newgate Calendar; but love, in this country at least, must be treated from the Puritan stand-point. There would, of course, be no difficulty in so treating it were the Puritan stand-point the only one from which it could be viewed. Unfortunately for human nature, there happens to be many another one than that. In a novel, then, which aims to portray life not as we want it to be,

but as it is, why should the various phases of the lever of existence be omitted? Why, indeed? It cannot be because of the Young Person, for ignorance has never preserved a virtue yet. Nor is it because of any conviction that woman is always either vestal or monandrous, for we are aware that that is not the case. It may, then, be due to some conventional idea concerning the limits in which ornamental literature should move. In that event we may wonder whence it came. Certainly not from the British classics, nor yet from those which we regard as our own. Perhaps, then, it is a secretion of the mind, a category of the intellect which, like the concepts of time and of space, has no existence outside of our own imagination.

To choose one argument from an hundred, consider Shakspere's suavest romance, "Romeo and Juliet." It is true that plot and characters are a transferrence from a story which Luigi da Porto fabricated out of a Veronese legend, and it is equally true that, the other day, somebody announced that Shakspere never wrote a line in his life. But let it be admitted that the tragedy in question is the work of another man with the same name; the beauty of the lines exist, the interest in hero and heroine remain unchanged, the drama is as palpitating as before, and yet the central situation, the one which lends it its charm and allurement, is not seduction, for in that case *Juliet* would be a victim to the wiles of *Romeo*, and the moralist might have his little say. But it is not that; it is a portrayal of that emotion which stirs the pulse of every youth, however noble, and every maiden, however pure, and one, parenthetically, without which the world would cease to be. And now, by way of example, let it be supposed that the legend of *Romeo* and *Juliet* is adapted and localized; that, instead of being the children of inimical robber barons, they are the children of rival jobbers in stocks; divest them of the magnificence of myth; put them here in New York; make them talk prose instead of melody, but preserve the central situation, and from where you sit you can hear the appeals to Comstock. To this it may be objected that the ability which Shakspere, or his namesake, possessed is overlooked, and on that hypothetical objection the point of this paper may safely turn;—there is no criterion by which a story can be judged as moral or the reverse; there are but two classes of fiction—stories which are well written and stories which are not.

The latter classification no one is ever forced to consider, but in the former are to be found the elements of that future branch of literature which may not be fiction, perhaps, or, at least, not fiction as we now use that term, but rather a sentiable psychology for the use of the idle, one that is dictated by the heart, one that whispers to the reader and disturbs him, and leads him unconsciously into that temple which Marcus Aurelius erected to compassion, to human kindness and abnegation of self.

To surprise the reader in this fashion is well-nigh impossible with the methods now in vogue. The ambitious writer has on one side of him a corpse still warm, in whose features he recognizes Romanticism; on the other is that silk stocking filled with mud which is the emblem of the Naturalists. But somewhere near at hand are tombs marked Dostoïevsky, Flaubert, Eliot—names that tell all yet nothing save disinterestedness, charity, and forgiveness of sin. Should he hesitate, he is lost, for romanticism has guiles and philters, the revery in the moonlight, the kiss of women, the shock of swords, all the luridness of melodrama enveloped in sonorous periods, round and empty. And naturalism, too, has its promises, the indignation of the critic, and coffers that overflow. Between allurements like these many have halted and will halt and conjecture, but presently, to-morrow perhaps, some hero of letters will brush them both aside and pass, with lip austere, straight to the tombs and kneel there and commune. When he rises, it will be with that novel which you and I await.

Concerning the possible elements of that work suppositions are not wholly idle. In any event it is permissible to fancy that the author will be too wise not to be occasionally stupid. He will leave conventionality in the skirts of the surplice; Goethe demanded more light—he will need more air, not the atmosphere of a seraglio, but some broad plateau where the lungs are invigorated by that mother of realism, nature herself. He will study the crowd and its emanations, the unit as well, and then, from his knowledge of nature and his knowledge of man, he will be able to explain the multiplicity of the ego, the variable influence of surroundings, the change of views that ensue. Behind the visible act will be the analysis of the invisible cause, the coördination of contradictories, the inevitable deduced from chance. And this so clearly, yet so objectively, that the reader who picks up the book as he might enter a fancy ball, suddenly, through the

mere force of accumulated trifles and unobserved effects, will find himself among men and women who no longer seem, but are, who appeal to him, for whom he suffers, and for whose miseries he would devise a cure.

It is this that the coming novelist will do. In the perspective he may leave the nothingness of creeds, but in the foreground will be the majesty of that Unknown which our intellect has been impotent to grasp. He will do this, more perhaps, for always in his ears will be the mutterings of the Sphinx propounding the eternal riddle. And by way of reward, a year or two after his death one publisher will confide to another that Soandso is beginning to sell.

EDGAR SALTUS.

THE NEW INSTRUMENT OF EXECUTION.

BY HAROLD P. BROWN, NEW YORK STATE EXPERT ON ELECTRICAL EXECUTION.

For several years the writer has carefully studied the details of the many accidental deaths from electric-lighting circuits, in order to determine their causes and, if possible, to discover means for their prevention. Three classes of current are in commercial use: the continuous, which flows steadily in one direction; the pulsating, whose impulses are intermittent, though constant in direction; and the alternating, which is a series of rapid reversals. Investigation showed that the first and second could by proper safeguards be made harmless to the general public, while the third was by its very nature hopelessly deadly.

Early in June, 1888, these conclusions were published by me in a prominent New York daily, with a description of the necessary protective apparatus. At once I was fiercely and bitterly attacked by the adherents of certain alternating-current interests, who loudly proclaimed their current to be "perfectly safe." Feeling sure that many more deaths would be occasioned by dealing carelessly with this deadly agency if it were regarded as harmless, it seemed an imperative duty to prove my statements to be true, and I asked Mr. Thomas A. Edison for the loan of some necessary apparatus which could not be elsewhere obtained.

His enemies have not yet forgiven him for his great kindness in permitting me to make the proposed experiments in his magnificent electrical laboratory, which is, beyond doubt, the finest in the world. These experiments proved that my suggested apparatus would save life and rob the continuous current of danger, so far as the public was concerned, and that the alternating current would produce instant and painless death at very low pressures. This work, which was for the purpose of protecting life,

gave me expert knowledge of death-currents, and brought to me a request from the New York State authorities to select and purchase for them the apparatus for electrical executions.

I was reluctant to undertake this, knowing that it would subject me to violent abuse, but I felt that this use of the "safe and harmless" current would educate the public to handle it with caution and thus save many lives. I declined to assume the responsibility of designing for this purpose a machine whose use would be an experiment with human life, but preferred to select a type of dynamo which had killed many innocent men who made accidental contact with its deadly wires. My experiments showed that the greater the number of alternations per second, or the longer the time of contact with the subject, the less was the pressure required to destroy life. It is therefore evident that the death-dealing qualities of various currents are approximately proportional to the product of the amount of electrical horse-power exerted in the body of the subject, the length of the contact in seconds, and the number of alternations per second.

The first factor is found by multiplying the current strength in ampères by the pressure in volts and reducing the product to horse-power by dividing by 746. By what is known as Ohm's law, the current strength will be always equal to the electrical pressure divided by the resistance in ohms. Therefore the amount of electrical horse-power received by a subject depends directly upon the resistance encountered in passing through his body. There has been a great amount of nonsense brought forward recently on this subject by numerous electricians and physicians who testified that the resistance of the human body could not be accurately determined because of its mysterious and enormous variations!

The greater portion of the electrical resistance of a living animal is in the skin, due to thickness of the epidermis, the presence of insulating fats and oils, and the lack of sufficient moisture. This resistance may be reduced by increasing the area of contact or the amount of pressure between the skin and the electrodes conveying the current, or by increasing the amount of saline conducting fluid in the tissues of the epidermis. If any one of these factors is permitted to vary, wide variations in the result are produced; or, in other words, a measurement of the resistance of a human body includes the resistance of the body

itself plus the resistances of the points of contact, which may be enormous. A New York physician recently cited a case whose electrical resistance was said to be 500,000 ohms, which is quite a high degree of insulation; in such a case the measurement must have been made between the pointed tips of long Chinese finger-nails bearing lightly upon the electrodes. One thousand ohms would represent the resistance of the body itself, the remainder being the resistance of the contacts and finger-nails. To settle this matter, Mr. Edison had resistance-measurements made of between four hundred and five hundred men, and with his characteristic originality devised means for obtaining practically constant factors. Two jars were filled with a weak solution of caustic potash and connected to the measuring apparatus. Each man dipped his extended hands into the liquid until the ends of the middle fingers touched bottom. The hands were immersed for thirty seconds before readings were taken. This delay permitted the potash to act upon the oil in the skin, converting it into a soap soluble in water, thus practically eliminating the resistance of contacts and epidermis.

The average resistance was found to be 1,000 ohms and the highest but 1,970; the variation being evidently due to the amount of skin surface in contact with the liquid, since the number of ohms per square inch of surface was practically the same in all cases in which the area was measured. The report of Mr. Edison's chief electrician, Mr. A. E. Kennelly, upon these tests is most conclusive. In ordinary applications of electricity to the human body, when the skin is not, by Mr. Edison's method, specially prepared to receive it, the passage of the current itself rapidly reduces the resistance of the epidermis by bringing into it more of the saline fluids of the body. The greater the pressure of the current used the more rapid is the fall of resistance.

Bearing in mind that the amount of electrical energy received by a person who accidentally touches two charged conductors depends upon the area, pressure, moisture, and duration of contact, as well as upon the difference of electro-motive force between the points touched, it is easy to explain the miraculous tales of the men who, often in good faith, claim to have received the "full force of the dynamo" without serious results. The man with the mandarin nails might receive 3,000 volts on his claw-tips without wincing, but he ought not to boast that he had "taken the

entire charge." A parallel case would be that of a man who survived a rifle-shot because the ball spent its force on a pocket-book and merely bruised his chest.

The physical effects of an electrical current upon the human body are three-fold. By what is called electrolysis, the saline fluids which form the conducting medium are decomposed, the hydrogen and acids appearing at the negative pole and the oxygen and bases at the positive. This decomposition and the passage of the current itself produce heat. As the volume of the hydrogen thrown off is double that of the oxygen, a movement of the liquid toward the negative pole is set up. Aside from this, a decided motion of the liquid in the same direction is caused by the passage of the current itself. If a vessel containing a conducting fluid be divided into two sections by a vertical partition of parchment, and an electrical current passed from one side to the other, the liquid surface will be raised on one side of the membrane and lowered on the other. In case the alternating current is used, the surfaces will remain level, but the constant change of direction of the electrical current will produce corresponding alternations in the movement of the fluid, thus delivering to the membrane a series of blows whose force depends upon the amount of electrical energy expended. Thus a man receiving a pressure of 1,000 volts, and having an electrical resistance of 1,000 ohms between the two points of contact, would sustain the force of 1.33 horse-power. Portions of this power would be absorbed in the production of heat and chemical decomposition, while the main effect appears in violent vibrations of the fluids and tissues, delivering tremendous blows within the vital organs.

This is undoubtedly the secret of the life-destroying power possessed by the alternating current. That the nerves share this vibration is proved by a recent experiment of Professors Ayrton and Perry. If in a magnetic field the alternating current be passed through a stretched wire, the latter will give out a musical tone if it be tuned to respond to the same number of vibrations as the number of alternations of current per second. It is evident that the molecules of the wire were vibrating before the string was put into the proper condition to produce sound. This is corroborated by the fact that wires become crystallized from carrying overloads of the alternating current for long periods, and by microscopical examination of the nerves of animals killed

by this current under high electrical pressure, since the nerve-sheaths are distinctly granular in parts of the body which have received the brunt of the current.

The chemical decomposition and heating effect of the current which a human body would ordinarily receive from electrical systems in present use would be too small to produce in themselves fatal injury, unless long continued, and there is not a case on record of death from these causes alone. It is true that the characteristic indication of death by electricity is the peculiar fluid condition of the blood and its dark color, which seem due, in part at least, to its loss of oxygen, since passing oxygen through it restores its normal appearance. But it has never been determined whether this produces or follows death, or whether it is caused by chemical or by mechanical action. As the combination between the blood-corpuscles and their oxygen is a feeble one, it seems possible that the current might disturb the relationship and set the oxygen free to form other combinations. On the other hand, the mechanical shock might produce the same result. In one of my early experiments upon animals, death was caused by a continuous current, and the characteristic condition of the blood was observed in a post-mortem examination by an able physiologist. It seemed probable that this death resulted from what is known as the extra-current from the magnets of the dynamo, which, on opening the circuit through the subject, would give a sudden rise and fall of pressure, analogous to the effect produced by a single alternation of current. Therefore in a subsequent experiment apparatus was used which prevented the extra-current from reaching the animal, and the highest then available pressure of the continuous current (1,420 volts) produced no ill effects.

In the latter case the amount of chemical decomposition must have been greater than in the first experiment, since much higher pressure was used. This led to the conclusion that pulsations, interruptions, or alternations of the current produced death, though it failed to determine whether the blood of the uninjured animal had been altered by the current, as in the other case, but restored to its normal condition by subsequent respiration. Dr. George E. Fell, president of the American Society of Microscopists, states that in a living amœba the protoplasm contracts when a feeble current of electricity is passed through the fluid containing it, and that a slight increase of current is fatal,

It is probable that a similar effect is produced upon the blood-corpuscles, and this experiment under the microscope would be interesting.

The physiological effects of electrical currents upon the human body have been accurately observed and described, though many physicians, through lack of mechanical knowledge, have false ideas on one important point. Since some men show signs of pain from a feeble current of medical electricity, which can be received by others without discomfort, it is assumed that the latter persons cannot be killed by any amount of electrical force. They might as well say that, since a trained player can catch a base-ball when thrown at a rate which would knock down and cripple a novice, a ball fired from one of Krupp's monster cannon cannot be relied upon instantly to kill a man whom it strikes. In each case it is merely a ball in motion that is dealt with, but the difference in the amount of power exerted is enormous. A continuous current causes a tingling sensation, stimulates nervous action at the negative pole, depresses it at the positive, and, if long continued, produces under the electrodes chemical burns or blisters due to electrolytic decomposition. The closing and opening of the circuit produce muscular contractions, which are intensified by alternating the current or by placing an electro-magnet in the circuit. An infinitesimal current passed through the sciatic nerve of a galvanoscopic frog causes a contraction which will lift a quarter of an ounce one-half to three-quarters of an inch. As this amount of work is beyond the power of the current itself to accomplish, it must be assumed that the electricity merely excites the nerve and allows the residual vital force to exert itself. If this be true, it may be possible that a heavy shock of electricity may cause a man's own muscles to kill him by their powerful contraction.

If a series of shocks are received at the rate of fifteen or more per second, the muscles controlled by the nerves affected do not have sufficient time to relax, and therefore assume a rigidity proportional to the number of impulses per second and the electrical energy exerted. During this state of muscular tension the sensory nerves in the parts affected seem to be deadened to external impressions, and dentists have long used this fact to diminish the pain of tooth-drawing. An increase in the number of impulses or alternations per second, or in the electrical pressure, produces

a greater degree of insensibility to pain until absolute unconsciousness is reached. In my experiments, 0.101 electrical horse-power with 26.6 alternations per second produced unconsciousness and death ; at 68.3 alternations per second, 0.075 horse-power, and at 288 alternations, 0.0049 horse-power, produced the same result.

Personal experience and the record of accidental shocks from electric-light circuits prove that insensibility to pain is produced by the continuous current at pressures of 1,800 or more volts, while the alternating gives the same result at about 160 volts. It may, accordingly, be confidently assumed that any reported case of intense suffering from an electrical shock is due to imperfect contact and therefore to low pressure exerted on the body itself. This is verified by the fact that such cases are usually accompanied by severe burns, and a burn is the evidence and result of poor contact. Applying the foregoing facts to electrical execution, it is evident that the alternating current is especially well adapted for the purpose. To determine what electrical pressure shall be used, it is merely necessary to search the death-records; the Jablochkoff system has slain its victims at 100 volts, while dozens have been killed at 1,000 volts. A contact such as was made by Mr. D. A. Henry, who was killed September 2 by 1,000 volts of this current, must have measured at least 5,000 ohms. He was instantly and painlessly killed by an expenditure of less than 0.275 horse-power. One-tenth of this amount has killed strong, vigorous men, but in order that no chances should be taken, the criminal's resistance can be reduced to 500 ohms by immersing both hands and feet in the potash solution. At 1,000 volts' pressure he would receive 2.75 horse-power, or one hundred times as much as is necessary to cause instant death.

A higher pressure would be dangerous to the attendants, since the alternating current even at 1,000 volts has killed three or more innocent men through contact with insulated wires. The preparations necessary for electrical execution are very simple. The condemned criminal's cell is visited by the prison authorities and his hands and feet are saturated with the weak potash solution which so rapidly overcomes the skin's resistance ; during this space of thirty seconds or less his electrical resistance may be measured, though Mr. Edison's researches in this line have rendered even this unnecessary. Shod in wet felt slippers, the convict walks to the chair and is instantly strapped into position;

his feet and hands are again immersed in the potash solution contained in a foot-tub connected to one pole and in hand-basins connected to the other. With this perfect contact there is no possibility of burning the flesh and thus reducing the effect of the current upon the body.

Dials of electrical instruments indicate that all the apparatus is in perfect order and record the pressure at every moment. The deputy-sheriff closes the switch. Respiration and heart-action instantly cease, and electricity, with a velocity equalling that of light, destroys life before nerve-sensation, at a speed of only one hundred and eighty feet per second, can reach the brain. There is a stiffening of the muscles, which gradually relax after five seconds have passed; but there is no struggle and no sound. The majesty of the law has been vindicated, but no physical pain has been caused.

Such is electrical execution. And yet strenuous attempts have been made to befog the public mind in order to prevent the use of the alternating current for the death-penalty, lest the public should learn its deadly nature and demand that the Legislature banish it from streets and buildings, thus ending the terrible, needless slaughter of unoffending men.

HAROLD P. BROWN.

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF THE CIVIL WAR.

VI.

BY GENERAL VISCOUNT WOLSELEY, K.P., ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF THE BRITISH ARMY.

THE LAST volume of this most interesting series of papers begins with an account of the attack upon and defence of Charleston. Were I bound to select out of all four volumes the set of papers which appears of most importance at the present moment, not only from an American, but also from a European, point of view, I should certainly name those which describe the operations at Charleston.

All European powers, England especially, are deeply interested in this question of naval attack *versus* land defence. Since the time of the Civil War many changes have, no doubt, taken place; many inventions have been made which greatly affect the relations between ships and forts. The size of guns has enormously increased. Torpedo work in all its forms has been immensely developed, and the use of the electric light has materially helped all night operations. Ramming has been taken more and more into account in the construction of all men-of-war. Various forms of armored ships have come into existence and have been subjected to all such experiments as peace admits. It is never very safe, however, to assume that anything will take place in war precisely as the result of peace trials would lead one to believe. It would be no good reason, however, for refusing to adopt new plans or novel inventions in our next war because they have not been tried and found to answer well in some former one. To act upon such a principle would be to handicap very heavily the nation that adopts it. It would be to hand over many great advantages to a more courageous, a more intelligent, and a more enterprising enemy. But it is only possible safely and usefully to apply the results of peace experiments to war preparations by

studying as closely as we can the experience with which past wars supply us. Now, since the great Civil War in America came to an end, there has been no contest in which, on anything like the same scale, many of the points which the efforts to take Charleston illustrated have been tested by actual fighting. It is interesting to summarize the facts as they appear in these papers. We have ample evidence both from the side of the defence and of the attack. Practically there is no important difference in the conclusions to which the serial papers lead us.

If there was in the whole of the South one fortified harbor which the government of the Union was anxious to seize, that harbor was Charleston. The whole resources of the Federal dockyards—it may be fairly added, of the outside world also—the inventive genius of the most inventive people upon earth, and especially of the most able constructors, were unstintingly employed in preparing an armada for the attack which it was intended should be irresistible. The ablest naval officers who could be found were placed in command. In only one respect can it be considered that the attack was deficient. It was not possible to spare for the coöperating army more than a relatively small military force. Practically, therefore, the success of the attack depended on the fleet, increased to the fullest strength, being able to reduce the land defences. During four years of war, despite all these efforts, Charleston held out, and it only fell at last because the advance of General Sherman's army and the common progress of the war necessitated the withdrawal of the garrison.

Nor is it possible to consider that these records represent at the present time only "ancient history." We in England have lately had much discussion on the relations between land defences and the employment of fleets. Almost all our arguments are taken from the time of Nelson, or from even earlier days. No one who looks into the matter can fail to see that at least these records of the Civil War represent facts much more closely analogous to the present relations between fleets and land batteries than any other operations of the kind in previous wars. Many of the details of the story add greatly to its interest and value. General Beauregard, the successful defender of the place, is able to show that in many respects the defence was under serious disadvantages. He speaks of the "inadequate force under him" (page 4), whilst it was the boast of the Secretary of

the Federal Navy that the preparations of the North by sea were of a kind "such as the hand of man had never yet put afloat." (Page 5.) The result of the first attack was wholly unexpected. "The repulse had not been looked upon as a thing possible by the North," and the news of the failure "engendered a heavy gloom of disappointment and discouragement." The Admiral was, of course, sacrificed by the Navy Department. He, however, like many other unjustly-used commanders, might securely trust that time would bring its revenge. The evidence of all those whose judgment can weigh with posterity tends to blast the reputation of the men who, by suppressing reports and perverting facts, continued to make it appear that the fault lay with the navy and its commanders.

As Admiral Rodgers says, not only had Admiral Du Pont been selected because of his well-founded reputation, but the commander of every turret ship and of the "Ironsides" was a man of known and approved skill and courage. None of these doubted the necessity for Admiral Du Pont's retirement from the unsuccessful attack. All of them consider that he was unjustly dealt with; and that the simple cause of the failure lay in the fact "that, whatever degree of impenetrability" the ships might have, they possessed "no corresponding quality of destructiveness as against forts." It is the serious duty of all our officers of the sister service to consider these experiences. If history has any value as a guide to the fighting of the future, it goes to prove how dangerous it will be to all naval officers if by any action of theirs they create a false public opinion as to the relative powers of ships and guns. If, as it would seem some of them wish to do, they succeed in making the public think that one gun afloat is worth several ashore, it is they who will have to make good that claim by success, when they are asked to attack heavily-armed and well-planned coast batteries.

The estimate in America at the time of the attack upon Charleston was altogether different; and most certainly the engines of war which have been invented since those days do not tend to redress the balance which during the Civil War told against the Federal Navy. The practice from guns fired from a floating target can never be reliable, and most certainly not as reliable as the practice from guns ashore. None but a fanatic on the subject will deny this, and the experience we gained by the

bombardment of Alexandria in 1882 proves this conclusively. Our firing on that occasion may, I think, be fairly described as erratic, although the conditions as to sea and weather were most favorable, and the enemy's return fire was extremely feeble—indeed, beneath contempt.

The one success which attended the naval attack upon Charleston is at least as significant as the general failure. The attack upon the Confederate batteries on Morris Island, which paved the way for the bombardment of Fort Sumter, was successful precisely when the fleet and army were able to combine in the attack, and because they did so combine. If this story be compared with that of Admiral Farragut's great success at New Orleans, when he passed the forts below that city, it will be seen that there was nothing in those events which tends to affect the force of the lesson taught by the attack on Charleston. As mentioned when discussing the capture of New Orleans in a former article, Admiral Farragut's success was mainly due to the moral effect produced by his gallant passage of the forts. Ship against fort, and gun for gun, he never reduced those forts, and seems to have inflicted very little damage upon them. Again, taking the whole story of the operations on the Mississippi together, it is clear that, while it was vitally important to the success of the Federal military operations throughout the vast theatre of war that the Federal, and not the Confederate, navy should dominate the waters of that great river, the result could not be secured by the navy alone. It was General Grant's reduction of Vicksburg and his capture of the other forts on the Mississippi which converted that river into the exclusively Federal highway that cleft the Confederacy in two. This coöperating action of the naval and military services, mutually supporting each other, and the fact that neither can be neglected without direct detriment to the other, seem to be among the most important lessons taught in the whole history of the American Civil War. Those lessons are of world-wide interest. I do not think they are affected by the story of Admiral Farragut's brilliant success at Mobile Bay, into the details of which I must not allow myself to enter, as it was, practically, almost purely an affair of ships against ships.

Before leaving the subject I may venture, however, to express the admiration which all unprejudiced readers of these papers must feel for the skill and judgment with which General Beaure-

gard conducted the defence of Charleston. It may be gathered from his article that he agrees in thinking that when forts are fairly pitted against fleets the general officer in command on shore ought to consider that he has a task before him which, with brave men under him, he ought successfully to accomplish. And, further, that, as a rule, the naval commander intrusted with the attack of a well-fortified harbor will evince a prudent wisdom if he arranges for the coöperation of such a land force as will clear away some of the opposition with which his ships, if alone, would have almost insuperable difficulties in dealing. Our own expedition to Kertch, during the Crimean War, supplies the very experience which is wanting to complete the lesson taught by the attack on Charleston. At Kertch it was possible for a land expedition, supported by the full power of the navy, to gain just those advantages which are illustrated by the successful second attack upon Morris Island. As the result of our combined attack on Kertch, the navy secured a passage through the Straits of Yenikale, which they could not have obtained for themselves, or without the coöperation of the land force that had advanced upon Kertch. On the other hand, the army could not have acted without the assistance of the navy, both in securing a point for landing and in the direct support obtained from the guns of the fleet during the disembarkation. The success of this combined operation opened out the Sea of Azof to our gunboats, which, to use Mr. Kinglake's graphic phrase, "carried the invasion into the very heart of the Czar's dominions, and produced a material and moral effect almost equal to all that was achieved by the terrible sufferings and fierce struggles before Sebastopol."

The one thing, as General Beauregard has well pointed out, which he could not have resisted would have been a well-appointed and powerful Federal army, that would have coöperated with the Federal navy in an attack upon his works on James Island. The lessons as to the power which lies in the combined action of army and navy, and as to the importance, at least for the purposes of local defence, of a certain number of coast batteries, cannot be ignored. It would be, however, a great injustice to one of the best soldiers, most skilled engineers, and ablest strategists who fought in the Civil War, were it not to be freely admitted that the defence owed much of its memorable success to the genius of General Beauregard, the Todleben of Charleston.

Through the scenes still to be enacted before the war was brought to an end, we enter now directly upon an examination of what must always be regarded as the "last act" of this great human drama. In this study, it is interesting and instructive to compare General Grant's own account of the preparation for "The Campaigns of 1864" with General Sherman's paper on "The Grand Strategy of the Last Year of the War." Again and again in the course of the great struggle between Grant and Lee one is struck by the relative disadvantage of the position occupied by the Confederate leader in one important respect. The "grand strategy" of which General Sherman speaks covered the whole field of war, and General Grant took upon himself the immediate supervision of the most important of all the operations upon which the several Federal armies were employed. General Sherman's Atlanta campaign and Butler's movements on the south of the James River were as much under his general direction as General Meade's Army of the Potomac. On the other hand, Lee does not seem to have had any actual control over the movements of the Confederate forces that did not belong strictly to his own army. One naturally somewhat hesitates to accept evidence which is given by other generals who coöperated with Lee, since we have had no corresponding evidence from himself. It has always struck me, however, that in some respects even Lee's very greatness made his position tend to at least one unfortunate result. Lee was so great, not only in character, in genius, and in reputation, but in the affections of the whole Confederacy, civil and military, that, if he was not to be the commander-in-chief of all the armies of the Confederacy and to direct and control their movements, no one else could effectually take that place. The importance of this fact comes out perhaps most clearly in the period after Cold Harbor, and in General Beauregard's evidence as to the proposals he made at Richmond, of which I shall have more to say presently.

The military student must not forget that Lee was not at the focus of information in regard to the general course of the war outside his own immediate field of operations; that he had no responsibility with regard to it, and could not take upon himself to act from moment to moment throughout the whole theatre of war, as General Grant did on his side. Whilst this was the case, no one in Richmond, on the other hand, liked to act in any

decisive matter without consulting Lee. This seems to have given rise to a certain headlessness which, I think, is to be observed in the conduct of the Confederate authorities, civil and military, during this year of the war. It does not appear that this headlessness can be reckoned as the fault of any one particular man in Richmond. This fact could be illustrated by incident after incident throughout this volume, and those who read these pages with care will see for themselves what is meant. The majority will probably agree to some extent with what is said here, both as to the fact and as to the cause of it. The enormous superiority in the mechanical means of intercommunication throughout the States under the Federal Government made that possible for Grant which was not possible for Lee. All must agree with General Sherman that Grant's great merit as a commander was the ability and clearness of vision with which he grasped the whole of the situation. He saw not only the position of vantage in which he stood, but the fact that it was well worth while, and that it would be an economy of life in the long run, for the Union to pour out life and treasure unstintingly; that by so doing he must in the end wear out the Confederacy. Surely the Union owes its life to having found the man who was ready and able so to direct its overwhelming resources.

Whilst fully recognizing General Grant's clearness of perception and his boundless pluck and determination, it seems to me that, when the actual campaign from the Wilderness to Cold Harbor is closely and critically examined, few impartial educated soldiers will deny that throughout it Lee simply and completely outgeneralled his great opponent. To judge, as I must do, from these papers, it would seem that many very able Northern soldiers concur in this opinion. Which shall we take as the fairest summary of the feelings of the Northern army on this point? Major-General McMahon states :

"The men could not help reading and discussing certain facts. Two years before, this same army had been placed much nearer Richmond with comparatively little loss. During Grant's advance from the Rapidan he had the advantage, of which he freely availed himself, of ordering troops to his assistance, not begging for them as McClellan did in vain. He depleted the defences of Washington at his pleasure, and of new troops more than the number of men with which he commenced the campaign joined him before its termination at Appomattox. The line of the peninsula and the advance to Cold Harbor and the Chickahominy had been McClellan's second plan. His first had been a movement from Urbana, with the possibility in view of crossing to the south side of the James and compelling the evacuation of Richmond and its defences. This plan had been overruled in Washington, and that of the

peninsula, also suggested by McClellan, had been approved as a compromise. But the plan of an overland march to Richmond, while protected navigable waters within our control led to the very door, was fully tried between the 3d of May and the 15th of June and had failed." (Page 220.)

Then, again, let us turn to the briefer summary by Major-General Smith. It is more technical in its language, but it is, fully as much as the other, supported by a detailed examination of the conduct of the campaign. He writes, at page 230: "In speaking of a concentration much better than the one which was made by the Army of the Potomac, Jomini says: 'The logistics were contemptible.'"

Turn now to the other side, and see what was the feeling of the Southern army regarding each battle of the campaign. See how the evidence given us proves that at the Wilderness Lee had exactly anticipated the very point where Grant would cross the Rapidan. (General Law, page 118). See how, taking advantage of the very movement he had anticipated, Lee flung his army upon the flank of the crossing enemy in such a direction that a part of Meade's army, had the whole operation been worked out as he intended, must have been cut off from the remainder, and driven into the river or the Wilderness in a condition of complete disorganization, if not to utter destruction. But the operation was not worked out as he intended. No; the course of the battle repeated incidents with which we are now familiar. General Longstreet's wing, arriving in magnificent order, was just a sufficient number of hours too late to produce the decisive result which Lee had justly reckoned upon. If analogy has any value, it is tolerably safe to say that, had Jackson been in Longstreet's place then, Jackson's troops would have reached the field, not perhaps in the magnificent order which Longstreet had the art of imparting to his men, but exactly at the very hour when Lee expected them. Had Longstreet arrived in time, the Wilderness would have been, as an offensive stroke, as brilliantly successful as that of Cold Harbor was as a defensive one.

Probably the most severe risk which Grant ran throughout the campaign, and the most brilliant stroke which Lee had prepared, was at the passage of the North Anna River on May 24. Lee allowed both wings of Grant's army to cross the river unopposed. They were completely separated one from the other, for the centre had been successfully checked. Both wings were at Lee's mercy. But Lee was ill, too ill for action, and I think it may be

said that this illness, which confined him to his tent and rendered him incapable of action for the time being, in all probability saved Grant's army from a blow that would have postponed, at least for that campaign, the advance on Richmond. If that operation had been postponed, it is difficult to see how Butler's army could have escaped destruction. That great results have arisen, and that the very course of history has been on several occasions seriously influenced, through the illness of generals commanding in the field, is well known. It would, however, be difficult to find a more striking illustration of the fact than is here presented to us.

I think it would not be unfair to sum up as follows the story of this campaign: On May 3–4, 1864, soon after midnight, the Army of the Potomac moved out from its position north of the Rapidan, and prepared for the passage of that river at the very point where Lee, watching it, had fully anticipated it would cross, and where he wished that it should cross. General Lee had deliberately chosen as his battle-ground the very place where Grant's army was now about to arrive. He knew this tangled wilderness well, and appreciated fully the advantages which such a field afforded for concealing his great inferiority of force, and for neutralizing the superior strength of his antagonist. General Grant's bold movements across the lower fords into the Wilderness, in the execution of his plan to swing past the Confederate Army and to place himself between it and Richmond, offered Lee the expected opportunity to strike a blow upon his flank, while his troops were stretched out on a very long line of march. Undoubtedly Lee expected that Longstreet's corps would be up at daylight on the following morning, May 6, but in point of fact it was still at least two hours' march away. That delay gave the Federals time to commence the attack, and partly to intrench themselves on the ground where they had been attacked upon crossing. As a result, the losses were not materially different on the two sides, or, at least, the action was relatively indecisive.

Nevertheless, Grant was foiled in his first attempt and began his movement towards Spotsylvania, to march round Lee's right. He was again anticipated in this movement, and nothing very decisive happened until June 11, after the failure of the two Federal attacks on June 10. Lee then somewhat anticipated the moment at which Grant's fresh turning attempt actually began,

and the "Bloody Angle" on the 12th was the result. That was the only means, and it was but a partial success gained by the Federal general throughout the campaign. Despite the capture of 4,000 Confederates at this point, no impression could be made upon the interior lines. Grant again moved eastward, and for five days the two armies manœuvred, one against the other, with little fighting. On the 18th June a final attempt on Spotsylvania was terribly repulsed. On the 24th and 25th June occurred the incident of the North Anna, to which I have already alluded. For two days at least Grant's army was in as critical a position as such a force could well find itself in. Once more Grant slipped away, and once more he found his opponent facing him. This time the position on the Totopotomoy River was too strong to be assailed; so he moved off towards Cold Harbor.

It is alleged on page 228, by General W. F. Smith, on the authority of General Meade's own statement, that Meade, annoyed by the credit which Grant was acquiring for a campaign which had been entirely worked out in its details by him, deliberately made no arrangements for the attack which Grant had ordered. Whether this be actually true or not, there can be no doubt from all the evidence that, from some cause or other, in the concentration of the Federal Army before Cold Harbor, and in the attack on Lee's position, the Federal Army was simply mismanaged and sent to useless butchery. Grant himself appears to admit the mistake made there. Nevertheless, it would be most unfair to assume that he was responsible for the disastrous details of that action. He throws the blame upon no one, and his silence on the subject is highly honorable to him. His method consisted, and wisely consisted, in a general superintendence of the whole campaign against the South, whilst he left the details to the several commanders of armies. He especially abstained from removing General Meade from the command of the Army of the Potomac. As it stands, General Smith's statement is a most appalling indictment of General Meade. It amounts to this: that, because the newspapers did not do him the justice to which he considered himself entitled as regards the movements of the army he personally commanded, he allowed that army to have a dire disaster inflicted upon it. The one merit of the campaign was the firmness and sternness with which it was carried on—elements which were imported into it entirely by Grant, and not by Meade. If General

Meade, from sheer, jealous sulkiness, did really allow the army under his command to be exposed to the awful slaughter it experienced at Cold Harbor, through lack of proper care and proper orders as to details, the crime was one for which no punishment, no condemnation, could be too severe.

It is quite true that by the end of the campaign Grant's doggedness had produced a certain effect upon the Confederate soldiery. All acknowledge it. But what was that effect? Undoubtedly they had begun to realize that, if the North would allow its soldiers to be exposed to such frightful butchery, the North might at that price triumph. But not for one moment did it modify the confidence of the Southern soldiery in their own great leader; and not even at the fatal moment of the surrender at Appomattox did a Southern soldier doubt that everything that any general could do for his army had been done by Lee. I fancy that if at Cold Harbor the proposal of the Irishman after the battle of the Boyne, "to swop leaders and fight it over again," could have been put to the two armies, there would not have been one hand on the Southern side held up to accept the offer. Would there have been none on the Northern? I fancy few of the Northern generals who knew all the circumstances would like much to put the question of the greatness of the two leaders to any such test. Of course, the opinion of armies is not always a fair one as to the capacity of generals. It is, however, a very important element in the actual power and effectiveness of a general in command. In this instance the opinion of the hour has been confirmed by the careful and critical examination of many able soldiers.

Meantime, while the Wilderness campaign had been proceeding, a very heavy blow had been struck against the South in the appointment of General Sheridan to the command of the Federal cavalry. Its organization as what is known in Europe as mounted infantry enabled the incomparably superior resources of the North in men, horses, and equipment to be developed with decisive effect. When, on the 9th May, 1864, at 6 A.M., Sheridan, with 10,000 horsemen, started on his Richmond raid, there was no force with Lee's army fitted to cope with him. Three days afterward the death of Stuart marked the end, at least as far as the Eastern campaigns were concerned, of the ascendency of the Southern horsemen. For an army like Lee's,

already shortened in its supplies, this fact was of dire consequence.

It is interesting to compare the circumstances under which this raid was carried out with those which attended the cavalry raid under Stoneman. Both to some extent partook of that characteristic of all such movements, that "to take the enemy by surprise, and to penetrate his country, was easy enough; to withdraw from it was a more difficult matter." (Page 153, Vol. III.) In that respect General Sheridan had the important advantage which the position of Butler's army south of the James River gave him. He was thus provided with a secure point to make for, where he could obtain supplies and a safe starting-point for his return march. Stoneman, on the other hand, was launched simply against the enemy's communications without a force sufficient to draw the whole of Stuart's cavalry after him. He therefore left them behind him, to serve Jackson admirably at Chancellorsville at the very time that the Federals were deprived of Stoneman's services. On the other hand, from the first the purpose of Sheridan's move was even more to ease Meade's fears as to the safety of his wagon-trains during the passage of the Rapidan in presence of Stuart's cavalry than to harass the enemy by attacking his communications. The movement was so made as to encourage and employ Stuart's cavalry during the general advance of the army. "Circumstances," as usual, "alter cases," and the practical difference of these two cases is well worth the thoughtful study of soldiers. Stoneman's raid, whatever its destructive effects, was a dangerous withdrawal from the Northern army of its eyes and ears at the very moment when it most needed them. Sheridan's raid contributed essentially to the general objects of the march of the Northern army, by keeping the Southern cavalry fully engaged at a moment when they might have seriously hampered Grant's movements by attacking the enormous train which his lavishly-equipped army left stretching out behind it beyond the Rapidan.

Taking all other parts of the theatre of war into consideration, the balance of advantage this year, up to the date of Cold Harbor, was heavily in favor of the South. Sherman had certainly pressed Johnston toward Atlanta, but had gained no decisive advantage over him. Beauregard had heavily defeated Butler at Drewry's Bluff, and had, as General Grant happily expressed it,

sealed him up between the James and the Appomattox rivers as completely as if he were in a "bottle tightly corked." The unfortunate expedition to the Red River had come to an end before the Cold Harbor campaign was over, and had not improved the general situation. In the Shenandoah Valley for the moment the Northern forces were certainly advancing successfully, but the number of troops there was altogether small, and General Early had been already ordered to begin the movement which was to take him up to the walls of Washington.

WOLSELEY.

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

THE TENDENCIES OF MODERN COMEDY.

BY CHARLES WYNDHAM.

THE features which give distinctive mark to our contemporaneous school of comedy-writing and of comedy-acting involve many subtile and complex elements. It is not possible to discuss all these within the limits which have been prescribed for this paper. So it seems best to sketch some of the more broad and salient aspects which may be supposed to interest the student of the theatre, with stress on such as may be called cumulative—in other words, such as are special and well-defined tendencies.

There has never been a time when the drama has had a stronger hold on the public mind than to-day. The novel and the newspaper have wrested from it certain functions which it was compelled to accept in earlier ages. But in suffering this diminution it has gained rather than lost, and been brought closer home to the hearts and hearths of men. Among all the arts it necessarily stands to the fore as the glass of the tastes and needs of society, its passions and sympathies, its hopes and fears, its errors and virtues. Here human nature looks on its *döppelgänger*. Shakespeare's summary in that *Ilias in nuce* where he describes the end of stage-craft to be "to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature: to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure," fits the play even better than the play-actor.

This is preëminently the case with comedy. Tragedy deals with man in his exceptional moods, concerning itself mainly with the great elemental passions, human nature in a storm, its thunders and lightnings and tempests. Its spirit and methods have changed but little with the progress of time, and the very limitation of the material with which it works denies it much flexibility or power of growth. The tragedy of a past age, so far as we care

for tragedy at all, is far more acceptable to us on the stage than that based on contemporary life; for in the former case it rises more easily into the domain of the ideal. Thus we like it in much the same fashion as we like poetry, and prefer its setting in the library to that behind the footlights. Even Shakespearian tragedy, that consummate flower of human genius, attracts but little as compared with Booth, Salvini, or Irving, who uses it as his vehicle. Those angry and fiery colors, as when

> "Some great painter dips
> His brush in hués of earthquake and eclipse,"

however they may still burn for us in the world's masterpieces, are not the pigments which limn our pregnant interests and sympathies. Tragedy, as a vital fact of the stage, long since passed its efflorescence.

Comedy, on the other hand, using the word in the larger sense, is immortal, and ever fresh in its growth. It lives with the sap of humanity and fits society like its skin. It rehearses the story of every-day life and manners, and shapes into art the normal, not the extreme and violent, experiences of man. It changes in its form and texture from age to age, from people to people, with Protean ease and quickness. Its pictures of virtue and vice are such as man may easily meet among his fellows in the salon or in the slums, at the hustings or in the workshops, in the club or at the races, in the streets or in the counting-house, in the church or in the gin-palace. The things represented are imbedded in the special characteristics of the time, and they are caught by art as the sun catches a face on the sensitive plate. This is the significance of good comedy, that it gives us, with a vivid, fresh presentment, warm from crown to finger-tip, the life that we ourselves live, brain-born and heart-born. It may wear a laughing mask, but more often than not a tear trembles near the smile, and a sense of something deep and serious lies close to the flash of mirth.

Thus seriousness of purpose is rapidly becoming a controlling element in modern comedy. The men and women of to-day are profoundly stirred by the varied problems which are pressing society for solution. Demos has raised his head from the nether world, and is asking questions difficult to answer and impossible to evade. Even in the United States, where the workingman has had from the beginning a far better

foothold than elsewhere, his voice is heard with no uncertain sound. The conflict of capital and labor in its varied aspects, trades-unions and syndicates, strikes and lockouts, makes this tumult felt far and wide. The sexual relation, with the cognate problems of marriage and divorce, offers many strange and perplexing issues. The woman's-rights agitation persistently looks us in the face and cannot be exorcised with either suave words or sneers. The war of religion and science, questions of public education, political and social issues growing out of the drinking habit, and a hundred others (to continue the catalogue would be useless), are knitting themselves into the bone and gristle of the period. Society is getting self-conscious in such dead earnest that it is turning sociological. Frankenstein is confronted, not by the one monster of his own creation, but by many of them, and he is equally fascinated and alarmed by the spectacle of the Titanic brood. Comedy drama can no more help absorbing such questions than plants can help absorbing the quality of the rich dirt in which their roots are hidden. If it were possible that it should be otherwise, it would become as barren and frigid as the stale jokes of the circus clown.

The brilliant comedy of the old English school, surpassingly clever as it is, and flavored with the finest intellectual relish, is losing much of its hold on modern audiences from the frequent lack of a strong central idea. It is only as the background for the genius of a great actor that the public cares a fillip about it. Yet with all its champagne froth and sparkle, the old comedy, when carefully scanned, is rich in evidence enforcing our contention. The period of the Restoration, which began that splendid reign of dramatic wit, was cancered to the core with licentiousness, but wore over it point-lace and diamonds. There were no social problems to solve, or—what amounts to the same thing—nobody was conscious of them. There were but few gradations in life—only sharp transitions. With the sparkling rakes of either sex life was a pure pleasure-hunt, and with Hodge at the plough-tail it was sheer endurance. Brutality in velvet and ruffles swaggered, and brutality in rags sulked. Between the two extremes there were but few interesting types, or, if they existed, they hid in a safe obscurity. Phyllis might be virtuous, the country squire might be honest and manly, the yokel might be loyal, but comedy made them all simple and stupid. The vicious scintil-

lated with brilliancy and wit, and the good were as dull as the rustic mud out of which they grew. The art of the stage mirrored the facts of life. Yet, in defiance of all our moral disgust and lack of sympathy, the exuberant gayety and the flash of give-and-take in the dialogue still enchant us in the reading.

As the age became more earnest, and thought of other things than pleasure, it forced other things into the drama. Virtue, however, in urging her claims, for a long time did it with the strut and rant of the new-comer trying to win recognition in good society. During the whole of the eighteenth century the gradual lift of social and moral life is closely reflected in the work of the stage. When we finally reach the period of Sheridan and Goldsmith, vice may be elegant and insinuating, but it no longer stalks over the stage with a front of brass and the challenge of superiority.

If in the eighteenth century the hue and tone of society, with those interests most to the front, were faithfully reflected in dramatic art alike in its spirit and methods, we may expect our modern comedy to be equally true to its purpose. The deep social issues which had their birth in the French Revolution, and have more recently reached such a tremendous growth under the stimulus of the industrial arts and sciences, are convulsing thought, and this generation is caught in the very thick of the fray. New classes, new responsibilities and duties, new ideals, new dangers, new needs, keep touch with us in season and out of season, at home and in the street, in the business office and in the political assembly. They are beginning to take hold of comedy with a masterful hand. They are sure before long to assert a stronger lordship.

Let us glance for a moment at two plays recently produced in England, "The Profligate," by Pinero, and "Wealth," by Jones. Both pieces have excited great interest, and are such notable examples of the fresh force moving in dramatic art that a more intimate study of their peculiarities will not be amiss. In "The Profligate" the happiness of two is wrecked by the shadow of an almost-forgotten crime, and the folly is exhaustively discussed of believing that the happiness of a pure, young, virtuous woman is safe in the hands of a reformed rake. In "Wealth" we see how the absorbing love of gain destroys gradually our best feelings, distorts our natures, breeds misery at our

domestic hearth, instead of happiness, and can even shatter the reason of its victim. In all these the motive is subjective, and at a comparatively recent date in the history of the stage would have been deemed quite unsuited to dramatic treatment. Not only are these problems made to live in the action and passions of the people of the play, but they are elaborately discussed between the characters, sometimes with lengthy argument that reaches monologue. Crowded audiences, made up of the best people in London, were attracted for more than three months by these dramatic debates, and the hold of the play on the public was unmistakable.

The success of Henrik Ibsen's comedies in Germany and England, as well as in the Scandinavian countries, is a still more striking illustration of the tendency of the play of serious purpose to dominate comedy-writing. The great Norwegian dramatist has been described by his friend Georg Brandes as a hot-hearted pessimist, at odds with existing conditions, yet with full faith in the possibilities of the future, believing that all social wrongs will finally be removed by an inner revolution of the spirit of the present or of some future age. His passion for the development of individualism as the panacea for the great world-sickness of evil is intense, and is in some sense the key with which he would unlock every problem. The two plays, "A Doll's House" and "Ghosts," which have been produced with great success in London, created a deep and genuine stir.

The former may be noted somewhat in detail to serve the present purpose, though it has been so widely discussed in magazine and newspaper that doing this may be a supererogation. *Nora Helmer*, the heroine of the comedy, is an inexperienced and frivolous woman, who has, notwithstanding, resources of undeveloped strength. She is introduced to us as a wife who has been trained to accept her husband as her law and conscience. She commits a forgery to save his life and spare her old father misery, believing this to be the burden of duty imposed on her, and expecting *Helmer's* loving recognition of it. That he fails of this in true measure, but only forgives her for sinning against the law and expects her to resume that ignorance and dependence which had made her his submissive pupil, revolts the child now suddenly burst into the woman. He had not been willing to take on his shoulders the burden of the crime committed for him. Had he risen to that

stature, she would have died for him. But now they must separate is the decree of the doll wife. Her instinct tells her in this crisis that only by keeping her own individuality sacred could she insure the personal salvation of herself and *Helmer*. Holding him at arm's length would give both room to grow, and then, perchance, they might come together, equals in true union, each complementing the other. However fantastic the conclusion, we recognize in Ibsen's subtile and delicate treatment the gist of the great woman-question and an earnest groping after light, the lack of which darkens many a household. That such a play as "The Doll's House" could so powerfully affect English audiences is significant in showing the set of the current, even after making all allowances for the excellence of dramatic treatment.

In a recent professional visit to Germany, I saw a play which had been adapted from the Spanish and which made a vivid impression on the throngs who visited the theatre. This comedy had ample stage-worth in construction, but the feature which made it vital and a matter of widespread talk was the purpose hinted in the first act and carried through with widening revelation to the last drop-curtain. The play of "Galeotto" illustrated the social truth that scandal, though without reason, tends by its very existence to create the substance of fact, of which it was in the outset only the lying semblance. No spectator of the social battle so often waged with poisoned missiles lacks knowledge of parallels in real life.

One need not stop with the typical plays of purpose. There are but few strong pieces within recent years which have really got a mastery over the public, without tap-roots in questions of social need. All that need be made emphatic is that the tendency to work the field of serious comedy flows with increasing strength. The French school of comedy-writing, generally conceded to be a model in method, has busied itself greatly for many years with the attempt to answer social problems. The mere mention of the names of such dramatists as Dumas, Sardou, and Daudet suffices to recall to our theatre-goers a dozen familiar examples. The modern literature of the stage in Germany would be no less prolific in illustration, were it needed, as might be expected in the case of a thinking, sincere, and strong-minded race.

It goes without saying that as long as human nature remains the same it will take delight in wholesome fun behind the foot-

lights. The charm of gayety and mirth from elegant comedy to rollicking burlesque is immortal. The medicine of laughter heals many a human ill, and the brief nepenthe which the stage so often gives to overburdened minds could never be spared from its varied sources of beneficence. Yet with all the smiles and gambols of the laughing god, he must yield precedence in the pantheon of art to the deity who presides over the sorrows as well as the joys of men.

The sister-art of the novel has given birth to many masterpieces, which have been begotten by the desire to enforce a moral. The drama, however, has been in large degree the slave of the canon, "Art for art's sake," in the minds of most writers and actors. In obedience to this law each character must be, as it were, stripped to the skin. Not a word must be uttered which does not in some material way help the action of the story and give effect to a situation. The dialogue is compressed into brief sentences, and kept strictly within those limits which are prescribed by an iron theory. The author works in a strait-jacket, if his heart burns with some truth which he wishes to utter. On the one hand is set the reality that swift movement, action like the rush of the bullet to its mark, exhilarates like strong wine. To this must be added the fact that the drama must necessarily deal with the concrete, not with the abstract; with personalities, not with speculation.

On the other hand stands the truth that opinion and sentiment give keener edge and relish to action, and that what people do on the stage acquires a higher distinction from the glimpses which we are permitted to get of the domain which lies behind the flashing eye, the laugh, the frown, or the sneer. The windows can only be opened wide by speech. What can be done in this revelation of the inner world of man, without crippling the energy of action, is shown by the great Elizabethans. The tendency, as has been intimated, is to give to the drama of to-day a larger share of the factor of speech.

What is the *modus vivendi* by which apparently alien features can be made to coalesce? It must be found no less in the art of the actor than in that of the dramatist. It is no heresy to say that the best acting does not belong to the drama of action. Some players act with their temperaments, some with their brains, some with both. There is more than one clever player

with a well-won reputation who puts no more thinking brains into his art than would fitly go to the Neanderthal skull. In some cases, indeed, the law of heredity almost bourgeons into genius by sheer force of temperamental power.

A really noble delivery is now the rarest gift in the actor's equipment, partly, perhaps, because he has had but little comparative use for it. It is this, however, which lays the heaviest tax on mentality in acting; and with the fresh departure in comedy the task of the player, while more difficult because more intellectual, will be raised to a finer ideal. The long speeches which the French stage gives to the actor have wrought a school of natural and beautiful declamation which enchants an audience even more than the movement of the story. To deliver a goodly succession of lines with fire, smoothness, and simplicity, and with their full pregnancy of meaning, belongs to the actor's best art, as was fully enforced in the injunction of the great master to whom we must all hark back for definitions.

Another tendency of modern comedy is toward realism. This need not banish the creative or poetic element from the playwright's workshop. To draw people as they are and evolve out of their ordinary lives and interests a story which shall lay a spell equal to that of romance—no writer surely could have a higher ambition or a more arduous one. To call a spade a spade, to banish sham and humbug from dramatic delineation, to paint the very lines and wrinkles into character as the actor paints his stage-face, to avoid exaggeration of treatment and incident, appear to be the growing bias. Howells, James, and others have set this fashion in novel-writing, and a similar drift in the stage runs parallel to its disposition to discuss the serious problems of the time. That hardness of outline which generally threatens the realist should find its corrective in a characteristic of our age. The social law is repression and reticence. Men mask or control their passions, and cultivate restraint as the crowning grace of good manners. The student of his kind finds keen interest in noting the pull of passion and enthusiasm chafing at the bit, and the play of impulse constrained by decorum. These half-lights make each one a pleasing mystery to his neighbor and contribute an endless variety of tone for the use of the painter of character and manners. Suggestiveness is recognized as one of the most potential forces in art, and it may be made to suffuse the most

realistic figure summoned out of life by the skill of the playwright with the charm of imaginative work.

The tendency of the comedy to realism has its effect in shaping the methods of the comedian. There was a time, not so very many years since, when the plays most in vogue permitted the player the use of a dozen conventional moulds, in any one of which he could shut himself up, like a man in armor, and walk on the stage a lively, talking puppet. Nowadays each fresh character exacts study and adaptation founded on a penetrating study of people who are playing their parts in real life. Those shades of distinction which differentiate men and women who resemble each other most closely, must not be neglected on the stage, to do justice to realistic comedy. Players have learned a lesson, too, from the restraint and self-command shown in actual society. No comedian who aims at the highest effects under the coming *régime* can begin too soon to master that sort of intensity which is bought with suppression and a studied moderation of method. The actor who tries to express everything succeeds in expressing nothing and hits in the air. The imagination of the audience, give it half a chance, will fully complete what he leaves artfully unsaid or undone. This kind of stage-craft strikes home, and the tendencies of the stage appear to foster it in many ways. The evidence seems to point to the conclusion that the future of the comedy will develop a finer quality of art in the player and give a higher intellectualism to the profession.

CHARLES WYNDHAM.

ARE THE REPUBLICANS IN TO STAY?

BY THE HON. GEORGE F. HOAR, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

PROPHECY is not one of the exact sciences. The wisest of our philosophers, Hosea Biglow, never showed more practical wisdom than in the admonition,

"Don't never prophesy—onless ye know."

That man must pay little heed to experience who undertakes to predict, with any confidence, the result of any future election of a President in this country. It is not true, although it is often said, that the voters of the United States are quite evenly divided between the two great political parties. There has never been a time since the war when the large majority of the legal electors of the country has not been on the side of the party that conducted the war to its successful issue. But it is true that the power which has overthrown free government in so many Southern States can still, by lawless processes, control so many votes in the Electoral Colleges that the next election of President must be decided by States in which the two political parties are nearly equal in numbers. We have, unhappily, had too many lessons that have taught us how slight are the causes which may change votes enough in what are called the pivotal States to give a majority to one party or the other. In addition to the chapter of pure accidents, like a heavy storm, or a flood, many petty circumstances, sometimes the fault of the candidate, sometimes contrived by dishonest and designing men, have decided the voice of great States. An unwise sentence in a letter of Henry Clay lost him New York and brought in Polk and Texas. The infamous forgery of the Morey letter deprived General Garfield of all the votes of California but one. That one was saved to him by the

popular dislike of a Democratic candidate for elector. The "artful aid" of Burchard's not very "apt alliteration" cost Mr. Blaine votes enough to enable his opponents to take from him the electoral vote of New York, and gave the country four years of Cleveland. If the course of foreign trade should cause a large export of specie from this country, and we should thereby be unable to maintain silver in circulation at its present nominal value as compared with gold, it is not unlikely that the party then in power would suffer seriously from such a condition of things, and be compelled by public indignation to give place to opponents quite as responsible for the evil as itself.

But we know better how to protect ourselves against these things to-day, so far as the Northern States are concerned. If we are able to defend ourselves against accidents, we can see no good reason why we may not expect the Republican party to keep the control of the executive, legislative, and judicial power of the country for another twenty-five years, and why we may not feel sure that it will retain its organization, its strength, its courage, and its ascendancy everywhere in the country where the American spirit dwells, where elections are free and the people well educated.

In the first place, the charge, so often made against the Republican party, especially by renegades, that it has lost its ancient virtue, that it has grown corrupt, that symptoms of disease, and decay, and dissolution are manifesting themselves, will not bear examination.

At the close of an argument on the question of jurisdiction, during the trial of General Belknap, in 1876, I summed up some of the evils which had grown up under Republican rule in the disturbed period which followed the war. Five United States judges driven from office by threats of deserved impeachment; four members of the House of Representatives detected in making sale of their right of nomination to West Point; the scandals of the Austrian Exposition and the Credit Mobilier; four judges of the State foremost in the Union for power and wealth impeached for corruption; Tweed and his accomplices in power in her chief city. I have never regretted, retracted, or modified a single utterance therein contained. I might have added other instances which it is hard, even now, to recall without a feeling of shame and indignation,—the dismissal of

Motley, the deposition of Sumner, the rejection of Dana, the putting the civil offices in great States at the disposition of the ambitions or the revenges of powerful and unscrupulous men, the sixty thousand fraudulent naturalization papers issued in New York. I did not then think that either the Republic or the Republican party was going to destruction. I made another speech a few months after, in which I compared the sixteen years which followed the war with the first sixteen years after the government was inaugurated,—the period of the administrations of Washington and John Adams and the first four years of Jefferson,—and showed that there had been in these administrations more corruption, not merely in proportion to the size of the country, but absolutely, than under the sixteen years of Republican rule. I never for a moment questioned the absolute honesty and patriotism of the great warrior and statesman under whose administration so many of these abuses had happened. The whole country, even his bitterest political opponent, concedes these qualities to him now. It never occurred to me that the Republican party could not and would not cure these evils when once its attention should be called to them. It never occurred to me that the remedy was to go over to the enemy ; that the wrong-doings of the party that loved liberty were to be remedied by putting the country in the power of those who hated it ; that we were to substitute for men who committed offences against the Treasury men who committed crimes against the elective franchise ; that men who used patronage to gain political power were to be advantageously exchanged for men who used fraud and murder for the same end. Washington and the pure patriots who were his companions set themselves resolutely to resist and to suppress the evils of their time. But they did not send to England for Benedict Arnold. They did not restore the Tories to power. They did not go down on their knees to George III. and ask him to take them back into favor.

Among the marvellous achievements of the Republican party, none is more marvellous than the steady lifting itself and purifying the public service which went on until the change of executive power. The world had never seen an instance of a purer or more efficient body of public servants than that which President Cleveland found in office when he came in, in March, 1885.

Subject, then, to the dangers above suggested, which must exist wherever elections are free, which exist in England and France to a far greater degree than in the United States, it is believed that the Republican party is likely to enjoy a permanent tenure of power.

This view is sustained

(1) By a consideration of the quality and temper of the Republican party as compared with the quality and temper of its great antagonist.

(2) By a consideration of its composition—of the communities, States, and classes of men from which its strength comes, as compared with those from which comes the strength of its competitor.

(3) By a consideration of its history, as contrasted with that of the Democratic party.

(4) By a statement of the doctrines, purposes, and measures of the Republican party, which give promise of health, strength, vitality, permanence, touching the very life and health of the Republic; while those of the Democratic party are in their very nature temporary, short-lived, perishable, trivial, cutaneous.

(5) The new States and the new immigration give promise of large reënforcement of strength to the Republicans.

First—The Republican and Democratic parties differ radically from each other in quality and temper. There are men of all sorts—good men, bad men, brave men, timid men, conservatives, radicals—in both. But the men who have given character to the great free States of the North are, in the main, the men who have given and now give character to the Republican party. The men who gave character to the slave States of the South and to the civil administration of New York city are, in the main, the men who have given and who now give character to the Democratic party. It was always bold enough where the interests of slavery required audacity. It is bold enough now where boldness is needed to grasp political power for the Southern oligarchy which controls it. But in regard to all the measures on which depend the prosperity and progress of a free and growing people it is timid, reactionary, obstructive. President Harrison well characterized it as the "against" party. As he said in his powerful speech at Des Moines, Iowa, in 1883,

"It was against freedom in Kansas; it was against the war; it was against the draft; it was against emancipation; it was against a greenback currency; it was

against reconstruction; it was against the amendments; it was against the Kuklux laws; it was against the Civil-Rights Bill; it was against the act to strengthen the public credit; it was against the resumption of specie payments. But it is not against any of these things now—it is underneath them."

It may be added that it was against the protective tariff; it was against the internal-revenue system; it is against the abolition of that system; it is against the Homestead Law; it is against measures for coast defence; it is against rebuilding the navy; it is against all practical measures for reviving our merchant marine; it was against the admission of the new States that are now coming in. The temper of the Republican party, on the other hand, leads it to be always on the look-out for new legislation, new improvements, and to use the vast legislative forces of the country, in all constitutional and practicable ways, in aid of its material and moral progress and welfare. It is the party that stands for something. It is on the growing side of the great political issues of the time. It has positive policies, not merely negative policies.

Second—When we consider the composition of the two parties, the States, communities, and classes of men from which the strength of each comes, we can form some rational judgment which has the larger and stronger vitality; which is the more congenial to the spirit of the nineteenth century, and which is likely to be the more congenial to the better and loftier spirit of the twentieth.

The Democratic party is made up, in substance, of the great bulk of the old owners of slave-labor and slave plantations, and of their children; of that portion of the population of our great cities and towns that were brought up where there were no free schools; of the keepers of liquor-saloons and those under their influence and control. Its strength is greatest where free elections are unknown and where the great historic frauds on the ballot have been committed in the past. The Republican party is made up, in substance, of New England; of the agricultural portions of New York and Pennsylvania; the States of the great free Northwest, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, whose territory was Freedom's birthday gift to the nation in the great year of the Constitution; Kansas and Nebraska, fruits of our first great conflict with the slave-power; Oregon, Washington and California—the larger New England which is coming into life on the Pacific; the Dakotas; Maine and Iowa, which stand at the head of all

human societies in the matter of education. These are the communities whose title to the confidence of the future is to be measured against those of Mississippi, and Louisiana, and South Carolina, and New York city.

The Bureau of Education a few years ago published a map of illiteracy, in which the territory of the United States was depicted in colors, the depth of the black shade indicating the degree of ignorance in different quarters as disclosed by the census of 1880. Afterward a newspaper published a colored map indicating the quarters of the country where the Democratic voters were most numerous and Democratic policies were ascendant. With slight and unimportant changes, the map of illiteracy would have answered for the map of Democracy.

There are some admirable men in the Democratic party. There are noble men among the Southern leaders. I have more than once borne willing and enthusiastic testimony to the many great and noble traits of the Southern people. When the fear of the negro is not before their eyes, and they are not possessed by the greed for political power, they are capable of excellent service to the State, both in war and peace. A prominent Alabama Democrat is said to have declared lately that, were it not for the negro, Alabama would be as surely Republican as Massachusetts.

But, giving our Democratic brethren all due credit for individual excellence, the fact remains that the men who do the work of piety and charity in our churches; the men who administer our school systems; the men who own and till their own farms; the men who perform skilled labor in the shops; the soldiers, the men who went to the war and stayed all through; the men who paid the debt, and kept the currency sound, and saved the nation's honor; the men who saved the country in war, and have made it worth living in in peace, commonly, and as a rule, by the natural law of their being, find their place in the Republican party; while the old slave-owner and slave-driver, the saloon-keeper, the ballot-box-stuffer, the Kuklux, the criminal class of the great cities, the men who cannot read or write, commonly, and as a rule, by the natural law of their being, find their congenial place in the Democratic party.

Third—The consideration of the history of the two parties encourages a like hope. The history of one party is a history of success. The history of the other is a history of failure. Human

nature, especially American nature, must be largely changed before the people will listen to Democracy and Mugwumpery imploring them not to judge of parties by their records. Sir William Vernon Harcourt put this thing well in his great speech at Oxford in 1873.

"I am old enough to recollect the great influence and authority which the Duke of Wellington exercised over the English people. They did not say, 'Don't talk to us about Waterloo and the Peninsula. That is an old story. We know all about that. What battle are you going to fight next?' They thought and felt very differently. They said, 'Here is a man who has rendered us great services, and in whom we therefore trust that he will, if need be, render us great services again'; and those sentiments of national gratitude and national confidence were founded upon the instincts of generosity and patriotism. Well, what is true of great leaders of armies, is true also of great leaders of political parties, and of great political parties themselves. Their past is not forgotten. It is the solid basis of the confidence they enjoy."

The future will have its great occasions, its great perils, its great trials, its great opportunities, its great interests. They will be as much greater than those of the past as the sixty millions of 1890 will be greater than the thirty millions of 1860. The people will then inquire, not as to the foibles and faults of individual leaders, but for the men and the party that created the protective tariff, which made the United States the greatest manufacturing nation on earth; that turned our twelve thousand millions of wealth into thirty thousand millions and made the United States the richest nation on earth; that made freemen and citizens of four million slaves and made the United States the freest nation on earth; that enlisted, organized, and sent back to civil life a vast army, and created a great navy, constructed on principles not invented when it came into power, thereby exhibiting the United States as the strongest nation on earth; that contrived the national banking system; that created a currency which circulates throughout the world on an equality with gold; that incurred a vast debt and made provision for its payment,—with these measures making the credit of the country the best in the world; that devised and inaugurated the beneficent homestead system; that built the Pacific railroads; that compelled France to depart from Mexico; that exacted apology and reparation from Great Britain; that overthrew the doctrine of perpetual allegiance, and required the great powers of Europe hereafter to let our adopted citizens alone; that made honorable provision for invalid soldiers and sailors. They will put their confidence there. In every great crisis pregnant with the people's fate, they will turn aside from the

men who opposed and obstructed all these things, The men who have forsaken us will return. The Mugwump and the Independent will come skurrying back. The Free-trader will forget his theory, and the scholar his dream. The capitalist will know where to look for security to his property, the laborer for good wages for his labor, the patriot for safety and honor for his country. I think, even now, the true patriot, though a Democrat, will rather trust the extension of our foreign trade to Mr. Blaine of the South American Commission than to Mr. Bayard of the Fishery Treaty.

Fourth—The doctrines, purposes, and measures of the Republican party touch the very life and health of the Republic. They give promise of health, strength, vitality, permanence. Those of the Democratic party are in their very nature temporary, short-lived, perishable, trivial, cutaneous.

A party extending over near fifty States and Territories must tolerate much variety of opinion in non-essentials. Its members will sometimes differ with each other as to the measures best adapted to accomplish purposes that are essential. But the Republican party has its creed and its statement of faith, from which no man can depart and maintain his Republicanism. Its Bible, its Creed, its Thirty-nine Articles, its Five Points, its Ten Commandments, are summed up in six essential propositions :

I—The equality of every individual citizen with every other, not only in legal rights, but in every opportunity and privilege of the State.

II—The obligation of the State to see that every citizen has an education which shall fit him for these duties and privileges.

III—The absolute freedom and purity of elections. The box where the American citizen casts his vote should be sacred as a sacramental vessel.

IV—The standard of wages must be kept up to the highest possible point. To that end, the policy of protection to American labor must be maintained.

V—Polygamy, which destroys the sanctity of the home, must be extirpated.

VI—The drinking-saloon, which corrupts and debauches the soul, and destroys the health of body and mind, must be suppressed.

This dignity and equality of manhood in a Republican State,

to which all the others above stated are essential, is the point to which all human society is tending. All the great forces of the universe are on its side. All the constitutional amendments, all the great measures tending to this end which have been adopted, or are proposed, are of Republican origin, and have been brought to pass or proposed against Democratic opposition. Does any thoughtful student of history doubt that they are strengthening day by day, and that the party whose wagons are fastened to those stars must be strengthening also? Will the people ever abandon either till it is accomplished?

The challenge has often been given and never answered that the Democrats should name any good national measure that they have either passed or tried to pass having either of these ends in view. I now think of no important law on our statute-book that is of Democratic origin, except the sub-treasury system and the Bland Silver Bill. Wherever wealth, education, power go, there Republican principles strengthen. As fast as the New South gets her factories and workshops the principle of protection is spreading.

Fifth—The new States and the new immigration give promise of large reënforcement to the Republicans. That party is likely to be the party of the future to which the people of the pioneer States join themselves by such majorities. As we write, Washington, North Dakota, and South Dakota are reported as having given large Republican majorities; while Montana, which a few years ago seemed as hopelessly Democratic as Kentucky, is reported as having chosen a Republican Congressman, with its Legislature in doubt. The new immigration, also, is bringing valuable addition to Republican strength. The steadfast, industrious, intelligent Scandinavian, lover of home, lover of country, lover of schools, lover of wife and children, finds his congenial place in the Republican party.

For these reasons, if the Republican party be but true to its ideals, I believe the future of the Republican party is as assured as the future of America. It will live, and grow, and rule until the South, like the North, is covered with workshops where workmen get fair and ample wages; until the returns of the elections everywhere represent the honest expression of the people's will; until, in America, the soul of man is reverenced everywhere without regard to the accident of his birth or the color of his skin; until the drinking-saloon is dethroned from its place of power in our politics; until Mormonism is extirpated. GEO. F. HOAR.

THE DANGERS OF ELECTRIC LIGHTING.

BY THOMAS A. EDISON.

So MUCH has of late been said and written upon the subject of high-tension electric currents and their probable or possible danger to human life, and so many different opinions have been advanced by men whose positions serve to surround their utterances with an atmosphere of knowledge of the matter under discussion, that the mind of an unscientific public has been unable to come to any definite conclusion upon the basis of "expert" testimony. It is most unfortunate that a practical demonstration in support of the real facts of the case could not have been made in a less tragic manner than was witnessed a few days ago in New York by several thousand people; and yet if the martyrdom of this poor victim results in the application of stringent measures for the protection of life in the future, if the lesson taught is appreciated to the full extent of its fatal meaning, the sacrifice will not have been made in vain. With the increase of electric lighting (which to-day is used only to a very limited extent as compared with its inevitable future use) and the multiplication of wires, these dangers which exist now in a thousand different parts of the city will be manifolded many times. In fact, the opportunities for repetitions of the accident referred to above will be practically unlimited.

I can write upon this subject only as one convinced. I cannot discuss it otherwise. The public would scarcely be interested in the details leading up to the position taken by myself and the conclusions to which I have come, for the reason that it would involve a mass of matter such as they have been attempting to digest during several months past; and, instead of explaining, I might succeed only in adding to the present confusion of popular ideas. But I may say that I have not failed to seek practical demonstration in support of such facts as have been developed,

and I have taken life—not human life—in the belief and full consciousness that the end justified the means.

The currents used for electric lighting at the present time may generally be divided into four classes :

First—The low-tension continuous current, with a pressure not exceeding 200 volts, used for incandescent lighting.

Second—The high-tension continuous current, with a pressure of 2,000 volts and over.

Third—The high-tension semi-continuous current, with a pressure of 2,000 volts and over.

Fourth—The alternating current, with a pressure from 1,000 to 3,000 volts and over.

The first is harmless, and can be passed through the human body without producing uncomfortable sensations. The second is dangerous to life. Momentary contact with a conductor of the third results in paralysis or death, as has frequently occurred ; and the passage of the fourth, or alternating, current through any living body means instantaneous death.

These are simple facts which cannot be disproved. There is a record of nearly one hundred deaths, which furnishes an unanswerable argument in support of these statements. Discussion and controversy may serve the questionable purpose of delaying popular faith in them, but they cannot change them ; and the sooner they are accepted and acted upon the less liability will there be of a recurrence of the late horror, which is still fresh in the minds of all those who witnessed or read of it.

It has often been asked why the number of accidents of this nature is larger in the city of New York than in any other city. The reason is that New York has a greater number of wires to the square mile than any other city in the United States. The percentage of deaths in other places will reach that of New York when wires are strung in like numbers ; but if electric lighting under its present conditions extends in the latter city proportionately, its death-rate will have been greatly multiplied by the time other cities reach its present high percentage.

Many suggestions have been made as to the best way in which to remedy the existing evil, and the popular cry seems to be, "Put the wires underground." But, instead of diminishing, this will increase the danger to life and property. There is no known insulation which will confine these high-tension currents for more

than a limited period, and when they are placed beneath the ground, with the present system of conduits, the result will be a series of earth-contacts, the fusion of wires, and the formation of powerful electric arcs, which will extend to other metallic conductors in the same conduit, and a whole mass of wires made to receive this dangerous current and convey it into houses, offices, stores, etc. It is thus evident that the dangers of such circuits are not confined to the wires which convey the high-tension currents, but other wires conducting harmless currents are liable to be rendered as deadly in effect as the former. It is evident, also, that a single wire carrying a current at high pressure would be a constant menace to the safety of all other wires in the same conduit. Even though these dangerous wires be placed in separate tubes in the same conduit with other tubes, the risk is not diminished.

Several instances are on record, and one I have particularly in mind, showing the possibility of serious accident through the crossing of wires. Near the corner of William and Wall Streets, New York, the underground conductors of the Edison Illuminating Company became crossed, and the current which was passing through them at a pressure of only one hundred and ten volts melted not only the wires, but several feet of iron tubing in which they were incased, and reduced the paving-stones within a radius of three or four feet to a molten mass. This system is so arranged that consumers are not affected by such accidents as this. They may and do mean expense to the company, but the public are entirely free from any possibility of danger. The crossing of wires in this way means the concentration of several hundred horse-power of energy in a small space. What would have been the effect of such a cross as I have described had the pressure been two thousand instead of one hundred and ten volts? and what also might be the effect were it to occur in a conduit in close proximity to hundreds of telephone wires and those of other electric-lighting systems? The risk, too, is greatly increased by the fact that consumers who are supplied with currents from a low-tension system are accustomed to handle their electrical appliances freely, knowing them to be harmless. If these are to be rendered at any moment dangerous to life, the result will be appalling. I say nothing of the injustice to vendors of harmless supplies of electricity.

So far, the deaths which have occurred from this source have

been chiefly confined to employees of electric-lighting and telegraph companies—men whose duties have required them to work in close proximity to the conductors of these death-dealing currents. It is true that a number of accidents, many of them attended with fatal results, have occurred to pedestrians on the streets of New York and other cities through the medium of fallen wires; but the risk incurred by the general public with the present system is really less than it would be if these dangerous conductors were placed in closer proximity to the ground. As the earth is approached the danger is multiplied. The connection and crossing of two wires by a line of moisture or liquid contact are just as effective as the contact of one wire with another when overhead.

That this error of judgment is not confined to the public, but is shared in by the officials of the city of New York, is made apparent by a resolution of the Mayor offered at a meeting of the Board of Electrical Control on Monday, October 14, and which is reported in the following form:

"That the numerous deaths caused by the electric light and power wires within the last thirty days, and the shocking manner in which they have occurred, furnish ample and sufficient proof that such wires are not being placed underground with a speed sufficient to insure the safety of the lives of the people of this city," etc., etc.

The logical inference here is that the lives of the people will be safe as soon as the wires have been placed underground. If a nitro-glycerine factory were being operated in the city of New York and the people desired to remove the danger, no one would suggest putting it underground. When it became necessary for the protection of employees and of the public to regulate boiler-pressures in the city, the authorities proceeded on lines entirely different from those which are being followed in connection with electrical pressures; and yet the cases are parallel, and the course of reasoning which resulted in a perfect system for the limitation of steam-pressure and the periodical inspection of boilers should be retraced, and the principle applied to secure safety from a pressure which, uncontrolled as at present, is far more dangerous than the former was before steps were taken to render it harmless.

The insulation of a wire carrying a high-tension current in the most perfect manner known may insure temporary safety; but time is bound to develop defects as the result of the action of the current upon the insulating material, of a change in the molecular structure of the material itself, and for other reasons. The

pulsations or vibrations in an electric conductor cause corresponding vibrations in the insulation. So powerful is this effect that the insulation gives off a sound corresponding to the oscillation of the current. So long as the insulation retains its original elasticity, the current is confined ; but the influence of the air, or of gas and other agents, tends to change the elasticity, and the billions of vibrations to which it has been subjected finally render it very susceptible of being pierced by a spark of static electricity. Thus an avenue for the ingress of moisture is formed, not only in one spot, but in many, through which the current may be communicated to any conductor of electricity near enough to make physical contact, or a circuit may be completed between the two by a line of moisture or the formation of an electric arc, with its subsequent destructive action.

The numerous accidents which have occurred in the city of New York during the past year show to a very large extent the operation of time upon the insulating material which surrounds these wires. When first erected, the current was to a certain extent successfully confined ; but the air is doing its work, abrasions are more easily made, and, without the adoption of genuine methods of control, "accidents" may be looked for in larger numbers as time goes on, due not only to deterioration of insulation, but to the multiplying of electric circuits to supply the popular demand for electric light.

The public may rest absolutely assured that safety will not be secured by burying these wires. The condensation of moisture, the ingress of water, the dissolving influence of coal gas and air-oxidation upon the various insulating compounds will result only in the transfer of deaths to man-holes, houses, stores, and offices, through the agency of the telephone, the low-pressure systems, and the apparatus of the high-tension current itself.

I have no intention, and I am sure none will accuse me, of being an alarmist. When the possibilities of the future are viewed in the light of recent developments, it must be apparent to every one that the time has come when those in authority should adopt proper and adequate measures for the protection of life and property, and my familiarity with the subject enables me to see very clearly the only true remedy which can be applied—namely, the regulation of electrical pressures. Once these pressures are reduced to a point which is harmless, the public may re-

tire in security and leave electricians to discuss the merits or demerits of various methods of insulating, the defects of which will only concern those interested in the commerce of electricity.

There is no plea which will justify the use of high-tension and alternating currents, either in a scientific or a commercial sense. They are employed solely to reduce investment in copper wire and real estate. For instance, in arc-lighting it is customary to put forty lamps on each circuit ; each lamp requires a pressure of fifty volts; therefore the total pressure on the circuit is two thousand volts. Now, if, instead of using only one wire for all these lamps, four circuits of ten lamps each were to be established, the pressure on each wire would be only five hundred volts. The weight of copper necessary for these four circuits of ten lamps each would be two and a half times greater than for one circuit of forty lamps—a question, as I have said, simply of investment.

The alternating current under high pressure and direct-current high-pressure systems are also employed, as I have intimated, to save investment in real estate as well as copper. If a certain district is to be supplied with electric light, the natural point from which the current should be distributed is the centre, with wires radiating toward the circumference of the circle of supply ; and if, instead of including in any one of these districts an area so large that resort must be had to high pressure in order to reach its limits, the distributing power of a single station be confined to a capacity consistent with safety, and other centres sought from which to furnish current to other areas, the necessity for high electrical pressure vanishes. But real estate in such centres as these is expensive, and the promoters of electric-lighting enterprises which spring into existence with the growth and stability of the mushroom, cannot afford to consider permanency, the security of the public, the requirements of small consumers, or any such questions, which would incidentally involve the investment of larger sums of money ; but, seeking the outskirts of a district, where land is cheap, or some abandoned building available for sheltering a few dynamo machines, they run small wires to the area of supply, enormous pressure being necessary to force the current through these small conductors over such long distances.

In the last issue of *The Electrical World*, page 254, is recorded a series of experiments conducted by M. d'Arsonval, a member of the French Academy of Sciences, showing "the effects of

continuous and alternating currents on animals." He says: "A living being is, above all, sensible to a variable state of the current, from which it follows that at a mean equal pressure alternating currents are more dangerous than continuous currents"; and "with a battery of four hundred and twenty volts (continuous current) death is only caused by long-repeated interruptions of the current." In other words, the continuous current of the above pressure could not be made to cause death until it was interrupted or made discontinuous—or perhaps a better expression would be semi-continuous. By a variable state of the current is meant a fluctuation of pressure between different extremes of voltage. The human nerve-system, up to a certain limit of pressure, cannot detect the flow of a continuous current if the voltage be perfectly constant. This constancy is obtained by multiplying the number of commutator bars on the dynamo. The brushes which are set upon the revolving commutator, and conduct the current from the machine to the outside system, rest alternately upon the different bars of the commutator. The greater the number of bars, the less will be the fluctation of the current, which may be likened to a wave-motion, rising and falling, and producing that variable state referred to by the French scientist.

Nearly all dynamo machines used for arc-lighting are constructed with an insufficient number of commutator bars to produce a steady continuous current. The ranges of variable pressure are not, however, nearly as great as in the alternating system. With respect to the latter, M. d'Arsonval says: "An alternating Gramme machine caused death when above one hundred and twenty volts mean potential." This is a small unit to contemplate after the glib manner in which it has been recently stated that this current is harmless at a pressure of one thousand volts. I have myself seen a large healthy dog killed instantly by the alternating current at a pressure of one hundred and sixty-eight volts. It is a simple matter to calculate the ranges of variable pressure in this system. The dynamo machine has no commutator. The armature or "bobbin" is wound in such a way that the whole of the current under a pressure, say, of two thousand volts, is sent out on the wire first in one direction, then is reversed and sent out at the same pressure in the other direction, or passes through the wire in the opposite direction; and these

reversals are generally made about a hundred times in each second.

The variable state of a continuous current at a pressure of two thousand volts means ordinarily a rise from zero point up to two thousand, after which, owing to the action of the commutator, it varies between, say, seventeen hundred and two thousand, while the variable state of the alternating current means a fluctuation from two thousand volts above the zero point to two thousand below it, or a difference of four thousand volts. The danger to life is probably proportionate to the fluctuation of pressures. When an alternating current of fifteen volts is applied to a human being in the most effective manner, the effect upon the nerve system is so violent and the pain produced so great that it is absolutely impossible for any one to stand it.

As I have said before, the only way in which safety can be secured is to restrict electrical pressures. The continuous current should be limited to six hundred or seven hundred volts, with a variable range not exceeding a few volts. As for the alternating current, it is difficult for me to name a safe pressure. Its effect upon muscular action is so great that even at exceedingly low voltage the hand which grasps a conductor cannot free itself, and it is quite possible that in this way the sensitive nervous system of a human being could be shocked for a sufficient length of time to produce death. The electric-lighting company with which I am connected purchased some time ago the patents for a complete alternating system, and my protest against this action can be found upon its minute-book. Up to the present time I have succeeded in inducing them not to offer this system to the public, nor will they ever do so with my consent. My personal desire would be to prohibit entirely the use of alternating currents. They are as unnecessary as they are dangerous. In the city of New York there are many miles of conductors beneath the streets conveying a harmless continuous electric current to thousands of consumers, the maximum pressure on this vast system never exceeding two hundred and twenty volts, which will force so weak a current through the human body that it can barely be detected. Furthermore, it is found to be commercially successful, and I can therefore see no justification for the introduction of a system which has no element of permanency and every element of danger to life and property.

This is no argument in favor of monopoly. If ever there is to be a monopoly of electric lighting in the United States, it will be neither delayed, prevented, nor circumnavigated by such subterfuges as these alternating systems, and their use cannot be justified on that score. I have always consistently opposed high-tension and alternating systems of electric lighting (although perfectly free to use them), not only on account of danger, but because of their general unreliability and unsuitability for any general system of distribution.

In contemplating the efforts of the officials of the city of New York to remedy the evils connected with electric lighting, I have been impressed in a way which must have impressed other onlookers. I refer to the apparent difficulty of determining where the authority to take action rests. The hands of those who wish to act appear to be tied, which is unfortunate, considering the exigencies and urgency of the case. In England they handle these matters better. The Electric-Lighting Act of 1882 provides in section 6

"that the Board of Trade may from time to time make such regulations as they may think expedient for securing the safety of the public from personal injury or from fire or otherwise, . . . and any regulations so made or amended by the Board of Trade shall from and after the date thereof have the like effect in every respect as though they had been originally inserted in the license, order, or special act authorizing the undertaking."

This same section also provides that

"any local authority within any part of whose district electricity is authorized to be supplied under any license, order, or special act, may, in addition to any regulations which may be made under the preceding provisions of this section for securing the safety of the public, from time to time, make, rescind, alter, or repeal by-laws for further securing such safety; and there may be annexed to any breach of such by-laws such penalties to be recovered in a summary manner as they may think necessary. Provided always that no such by-laws shall have any force or effect unless and until they have been confirmed by the Board of Trade and published in such manner as the Board of Trade may direct."

Thus to a responsible body is given discretionary power for the protection of the public, and local authorities (by which is meant any municipality) have the right to apply to this board for relief from any danger which they believe to exist in connection with electric-lighting systems. Certainly the responsibility for the protection of the people of our city should be as definitely placed, and those to whom such authority is given should adopt rigid rules for the restriction of electrical pressures. Perhaps police

control would be even more adequate than the English system. I am not altogether familiar with the details of the system of boiler inspection which prevails in New York, but I believe it is very efficient and would serve as an excellent model for the case under discussion.

When the authorities require electrical pressures to be kept within the limits of safety, and when there is an efficient corps of inspectors, as in the case of boilers, to see that the rules adopted are carried out, the security which the public demand will be attained; but until then nothing better can be looked for than a multiplication of the casualties of the past few months.

THOMAS A. EDISON.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

THE UNION MEN OF THE SOUTH.

IN EVERY Southern State at the commencement of the rebellion there lived a class of men, prominent and influential in political and social life, whose patriotism, devotion to principle, wisdom and courage, trials and sufferings, have been scarcely touched upon by late writers upon the war and its causes and results. Most of them were then of mature years; all of them had been born and reared in the South. They were slave-owners and believed that slavery was right. Many of them were Democrats; none of them were Republicans. Most of them were disappointed at the election of Mr. Lincoln, and feared that his administration and that of the Republican party, which they considered sectional and aggressive, would be unfriendly, if not actually hostile, to the welfare of their section, where their pride, interests, and sympathies were all centred. Many of their wives, mothers, and daughters were Secessionists. Their sons, many of them, were the first to enlist in the Confederate ranks. These men doubted the policy of secession, and, with a courage and manhood which have no parallel, denounced the movement and predicted its failure and the ruin of the South. In so doing they knew that they were courting certain political ostracism and defeat, subjecting themselves to danger and perhaps to death, and to what was equally terrible to men of their pride and character—the changing of the love and confidence of their neighbors and friends, and even their kindred, into bitter hatred; and yet these men through all those dreary, doubtful years of war, some at their homes, some in the mountains, some in exile, some in prison, and others on the battle-field beneath the stars and stripes, never wavered or lost hope in the success of the one cause for which they had sacrificed and dared so much—the success of the Union arms.

Their voices were never heard among the croakers; when they could not approve the policy of the government, they fought on in silence; when colored troops were enlisted, they faltered not; when the Emancipation Proclamation swept away their fortunes, they did not complain. The success of one political party or the other was no victory to them, except as it indicated the determination of the people to preserve the government by suppressing the rebellion. They did not regard the war, as many writers do, as a war between the North and South, but between those everywhere who loved their government and those who wished to see it die; and if their hearts were not too full of sadness to harbor better feelings, those feelings went out toward the Northern "Copperhead" rather than toward their misguided or even their vicious neighbors. They did not consider it a rebellion of States, but a rebellion of rebels. They knew that they were sustained in their own section by thousands of Southerners as courageous and patriotic as themselves, and by hundreds of thousands who, though unable to give them active support, were praying for success.

In 1866, after the government had, rightfully or wrongfully, freed the slaves of those loyal men, along with the slaves of their rebel neighbors, and then feared to confer upon them the power to protect that freedom,—the ballot,—it was these same loyal Southern men who, in the memorable loyalist's convention at Philadelphia,

persuaded—I might say forced—the dominant party to adopt that measure; and in the same spirit of liberality they opposed the proposition to disfranchise a large number of their white neighbors who had been engaged in rebellion. Next to their devotion to the Union, their desire for peace and good government in the South through a liberal policy by the victorious party was the aim and hope of these men. Then came reconstruction and the reorganization of political parties in the South. It must be written that the National Republican party, controlled by Northern politicians, in the exercise of its powerful political influence and the bestowal of its great patronage, in every Southern State and in almost every instance rejected the counsels of these brave and experienced men, and sought to build upon three elements only—the negro, the carpet-bagger, and a few new converts from the Confederate element. This is the only blur upon the otherwise magnificent record of that party.

W. W. MILLS.

II.

TAXATION OR NON-TAXATION FOR CHURCHES.

THE RECENT adoption by the Constitutional Convention of the new State of Washington of a provision requiring the taxation of all church property opens anew the question whether the time-honored policy of exempting churches and charitable institutions from their share in the ordinary burdens of the State is, after all, the wisest one to be pursued, and has a substantial foundation in common-sense. The argument most frequently heard in favor of exemption is that the practice is well established and has worked so well thus far in the world's history that any change of a revolutionary character would not only be unwise, but deeply injurious to the churches and the cause of religion generally. The wiser thought of the time, however, strongly favors a complete separation of church and state. The contention in favor of leaving charitable institutions free from taxation rests on a different basis from that which is applicable to churches, since the former may reasonably be considered to be of at least direct potential benefit to all the members of the community. There is a very large class of citizens who have no sympathy with the churches as such, but who, nevertheless, are compelled to bear their share of supporting them. There is an element of positive injustice in this, which the American people should be quick to perceive and resent.

Really, is not the plan of letting churches go free from tax-paying, on the ground that they act in a sense as a sort of moral police force, an old-fogy notion which the world has outgrown, and ought to have cast aside before this time? Consider for a moment how it is abused. Think of the enormous property owned by the Trinity Corporation in New York City, with which the Tax Department and the Board of Assessors have nothing to do, forsooth, because it is owned by a church! What an outrageous piece of injustice is this! Had a few other church enterprises gone into the same business, acquiring property on a large scale, without doubt the evil would have worked its own remedy long ago. For one I am glad to see the spirit that has been manifested in Washington. It is true that California has shown the way in this direction, and it is not apparent that the churches in that State have suffered on account of the policy there first put in operation. Some of the feebler churches may be injuriously affected by the necessity of paying their share of the taxes, but on the whole the tendency will be to prevent the erection of churches which have no adequate cause for existence and no "visible means of support." As the majority of church-goers are, presumably, tax-payers, it will in the end make no difference to them whether the taxes come out of their pockets directly or indirectly; and as for non-church-goers, who under our wise laws have the same rights, liberties, and privileges as the most devout regular attendants on Sunday worship, they will no longer be required to submit to the compulsion of paying their share toward the support of institutions in which they feel little, if any, interest, even if they do not entertain toward them feelings of positive hostility. Common-sense, the American spirit of fair play, and the demands of justice and of right dealing between man and man, and between one corporation and another, all justify and require the abolition

of the antiquated and inequitable system of no taxation for churches. The Washington convention has taken a step in the right direction, and one that the people of that State ought to approve most heartily.

PHILO R. SYLVESTER.

III.

SOME EARLY HARVARD CUSTOMS.

WHETHER or not a "fast set" now exists at Harvard University is for others to determine, but that such a "set" should have existed during the early decades of the institution seems well-nigh impossible. He must, indeed, have been a bold and reckless youth who would dare to defy the iron-clad, steel-barred regulations with which the early fathers of New England encased the youthful tendencies of the rising generation. That these restrictions were submitted to by students of sufficient age and ability to "make and speak true Latin in verse and prose," according to the early requirements for admission, and to use the language in familiar conversation, their own tongue being prohibited,—"*Scholares vernaculâ linguâ intra collegii limites, nullo prætextu, utuntor*,"—is as certain as it is incredible. And they have transmitted to us ample evidence of their sound principles and scholarly attainments, as well as of their mental and moral force, which acted so potently on the growing affairs of the colonies.

Corporal punishment by "boxing" and by stripes, which must not be "inhuman or immoderate," was sanctioned by law for many years. In the year 1656 it was ordered by law "that the president and fellows of Harvard College for the time being, or the major part of them, . . . are hereby empowered, according to their best discretion, to punish all misdemeanors of the youth in their society, either by fine or whipping in the hall openly, as the nature of the offence shall require, not exceeding ten shillings, or ten stripes for one offence." These punishments were administered with a gravity becoming the offence and the dignity of the college government.

In the diary of Judge Samuel Sewall, "the good and wise," is recorded an instance of such public punishment for "speaking blasphemous words." The guilty person was condemned to be "publicly whipped before all the scholars"; to be "suspended from taking his bachelor's degree and to sit alone by himself, uncovered, at meals, during the pleasure of the president and fellows." The sentence was twice read publicly, and, after prayer by the president, the stripes were inflicted, the offender kneeling, and the president concluded the exercises with solemn prayer. The law permitting corporal punishment was not abolished for more than a century after the establishment of the college.

According to the Dunster code of laws, prepared by the first president, all sophisters and bachelors, "until themselves made commonplace," were required not only to attend church, and to refrain from "gestures that might show contempt or neglect of God's ordinances," but to repeat publicly the sermons in the hall after service. They might not, without permission, connect themselves with the artillery or "train band," nor go out of town or "pragmatically intrude or intermeddle in other men's affairs." If the student were of "known gravity" and "of approved sober and virtuous conversation," and if the president so decreed, he might be allowed to join a military band.

Miscellaneous purchases, or moneyed transactions of any sort, to the value of a sixpence, were distinctly forbidden, without the allowance of parents, guardians, or tutors (the latter word is invariably spelled with a capital), and any contraband article so bought, sold, or enchanged was liable to forfeiture at the discretion of the president.

The use of tobacco, except by order of a physician, consent of parents, or permission of the president, was not allowed. If a physician's certificate procured the privilege, the fragrant weed might be indulged in "in a sober and private manner."

In the year 1722, the gay youth of the college were forbidden, during the exercises of commencement week, to prepare or provide any such luxurious and ungodly viands as "plum cake, or roasted, boiled, or baked meats," and even the use of "pies

of any kind" was forbidden, together with "distilled liquors or any composition made therewith." The rooms of commencers were visited by the president and corporation, and contraband articles which were found were seized and fines imposed on the unlucky students. What would a Harvard student of the year 1889 think of a warning against violating the above decree by the use of "plain cake," the penalty actually being the withholding of the degree, or, if the degree had already been given, the name was to be left out of or "rased from the catalogue of the graduates."

As late as 1753 the overseers of the college recommended the corporation "to restrain unsuitable and unseasonable dancing." At one period Friday was fixed upon for commencement day, in order that there might be less remaining time in the week to be spent in frolicking. This decree, depriving the young people in the vicinity of a much-enjoyed holiday, was, however, soon reversed.

Very little respect seems to have existed for the judgment of the students, and President Mather writes of his reluctance to leave off preaching to a congregation of over one thousand souls, such as constituted his Boston church, and to devote his time, instead, to the exposition of the Word to "forty or fifty children, few of them capable of edification," by such exercises as the reverend president's tough theological discourses.

Regulations concerning students' commons were of similar severity, and in President Dunster's time the relations between the students and the butler, cook, and steward were established by a code of laws. The steward was relieved from the necessity of taking, in payment for debt, any pay "useless, hazardous, or importing detriment to the college, as lean cattle to feed, etc." No student, without the permission of the president or, in his absence, of the senior fellow, might leave the hall at meal-time before thanksgiving was ended. And one can easily imagine that a young man of lively disposition would need to exercise his wits to the utmost in order to provide any amusement beyond what could be found in the study of Greek, Hebrew, and Latin.

HELEN MARSHALL NORTH.

IV.

CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM AGAIN.

GENERAL JOHN POPE, in the September number of this REVIEW, declares that "the fact that any such system [of civil service] worked well in France or Germany or England would not only *not* be presumptive evidence that it would suit us, but actual proof that it would not." The reform of the civil service is but a logical step in the political development of England. The old system in England and in the United States was founded on the theory that public offices are the property of the ruler, and the experience of both countries shows conclusively how the radical vices of that system can be corrected. If the successful issue of the administrative method in England is conclusive evidence that it is not adapted to this country, then we should expunge from our constitution the theory of executive power, the division of government into three great departments with well-defined jurisdictions, two houses of legislation, with the whole body of parliamentary law, trial by jury, habeas corpus, the common law, with its vast stores of wisdom extending to all business and all personal relations, the long series of statutes so far as not repugnant to our system, criminal definitions and procedure, the theory of military as subordinate to civil authority, the political conception of domestic and individual rights and duties, drawn from the same source from which flowed our blood, language, and civilization. The science of administration has made much greater progress in Great Britain than in the United States, striking deeper into the social life and political system. The merit system has proved highly successful in the Federal administration as well as in the States of New York and Massachusetts, and in the great municipalities of New York, Brooklyn, Boston, and many others. The fact that any principles of political action have been found salutary in one country is by no means a sufficient reason for introducing them into another. The probability that they may be salutary increases with all that is in common in the race of language,

religion, laws, institutions, and civilization. Because found salutary in England it by no means follows that this system is not republican in spirit and consistent with the practical administration of government under our institutions.

General Pope declares that there cannot be "a greater or more misleading fallacy than the oft-repeated saying that 'the business of the government should be conducted on business methods.'" The vast clerical force at Washington and in the large offices throughout the country are not representative officers, and there is no sphere for partisan activity or opinions in the honest and faithful performance of their work. A department, custom-house, or post-office is a mere business agency for the transaction of the business of the whole people economically and efficiently, and it should be conducted by the same business methods, no matter which party is in power.

General Pope speaks of an "order or a law"—he does not seem to know which—that deprives one hundred thousand citizens of all participation in public affairs except what is covered by a mere vote; says that they are practically disfranchised and deprived of half their rights and duties as citizens, and that they are political eunuchs, incapacitated for the duties of good citizens. The Civil-Service Act and rules, on the contrary, give independence and full liberty to office-holders to express opinions and exercise the duties of citizenship by forbidding removals for refusing to pay political assessments, or for refusal to be coerced in political action, or for refusal to render political service. The only "order or law" which General Pope could have had in mind must have been an order issued by President Cleveland, which declared that "office-holders are the agents of the people—not their masters."

Party government and the salutary activity of parties are thus made purer and more efficient. The authority and time of officials should not be prostituted to the servile work of partisan politics, and political assessments extorted under the fear of removal. Every honest interest and zeal in political contests are open to every office-holder under the merit system.

General Pope advances the novel suggestion that the Representative in Congress is the person whose recommendation should carry most weight in appointments to public office. In 1869 a Representative said in a debate in the House: "It is no more a part of a Representative's duty to seek and dispose of executive offices than to solicit pardons for traitors or condemned criminals." In a debate in 1870 another Representative said: "I appeal to the members of the House if it is not one of the greatest curses of the position of a member of Congress that there are continual demands made on his time and patience by persons whom it is utterly impossible for him to satisfy, who demand that he shall secure offices for them." The chief labor of the President, collectors, and postmasters has been to reward the personal friends and punish the personal foes of the leaders of the dominant faction of the dominant party. To consult Congressmen in appointments is to ignore the motives that rule human conduct in practical affairs. Without patronage Congressmen may represent the will of the people, but with it they do not.

In March, 1870, Mr. Garfield said in the House of Representatives: "We press appointments upon the departments; we crowd the doors. . . . Senators and Representatives throng the offices and the bureaus until the public business is obstructed, . . . and men are appointed, not because they are fit for their positions, but because we ask it. . . . There, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, is the true field for retrenchment and reform; . . . in this direction is the true line of statemanship." Seven years later, in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Mr. Garfield said that "one-third of the working hours of Senators is hardly sufficient to meet the demands upon them in reference to appointments. . . . The present system impairs the efficiency of the legislators; . . . it degrades the civil service; . . . it repels from the service those high and manly qualities which are so essential to a pure and efficient administration; and, finally, it debauches the public mind by holding up public office as the mere reward of party zeal." In his message in 1870 President Grant said: "The present system does not secure the best men, and not often fit men, for the public service." A committee of the Senate in 1882 said: "The malign influence of political domination in appointments to office is widespread, and reaches out from the

President himself to all possible means of approach to the appointing power. It poisons the very air we breathe. No Congressman in accord with the dispenser of power can escape it. . . . The late Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Windom, is reported to have said that five-sixths of the applicants for office, while he administered the Treasury, based their claims, not on merits, fitness, or character, but on their poverty and incapacity to otherwise obtain a livelihood."

General Pope would aggravate the administrative disorder which prevails in the United States by giving a monopoly of office and plunder to the victorious party, allowing an irresponsible body dominated by professional office-seekers and office-holders to usurp the election of President, and by having appointments to places outside of Washington made on the recommendation of the local Congressman, to the confusion of executive and legislative functions, of Federal and State authority, besides being impracticable, even according to General Pope's theory, as some of the Congressmen "would oppose the policies which the people commanded to be carried out," and not be fit instruments. Kent, in his "Commentaries," is of the opinion that the President's power of nomination is, for all the useful purposes of restraint, equivalent to the power of appointment, and that, if the President were not expressly invested with the exclusive right of nomination, the organization of the executive department would be very unskilful, and the government degenerate into a system of cabal, favoritism, and intrigue.

Some of the evils of patronage have been suppressed by Congress and the Executive. The tenth section of the Civil-Service Act of January 16, 1883, declares that "no recommendation of any person who shall apply for office or place under the provisions of this act, which may be given by any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, except as to the character or residence of the applicant, shall be received or considered by any person concerned in making any examination or appointment under this act." The President has made, in the civil-service rules, the use of official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or controlling the result thereof, punishable by dismissal from office; and declared that "any appointing or nominating officer who shall make inquiries concerning, or in any other way attempt to ascertain, the political or religious opinion or affiliations of any eligible, or who shall discriminate in favor of or against any eligible because of the eligible's political or religious opinions or affiliations, shall be dismissed from office." The rules also provide that selections for appointments shall be made from the three highest in grade certified for appointment on the basis of merit shown on the examinations.

William H. Seward, in his life of John Quincy Adams, describes the opposition to the administration of Mr. Adams as more determined, bitter, and unscrupulous than any which has ever assailed a President of the United States; but yet he says of him: "His views of the sacred nature of the trust imposed upon him by his fellow-citizens were too exalted to allow him to desecrate the power with which it clothed him to the promotion of party or personal interests. . . . Neither did an opposition to his administration alone, except there was a marked practical unfitness for office, ever induce him to remove an individual from a public station."

It is needless to multiply quotations. The merit system commends itself as republican in spirit and the only sound basis for an efficient and economical public service. The old spoils system is doomed. The competitive system is fixed as a part of our institutions as permanent as it is salutary. Within the sphere of the system, Congress and appointing officers have been relieved of demoralizing solicitation, and vicious intrigues and bargains for office are diminished. Twenty-eight thousand places are no longer spoils to be promised for votes or as rewards for partisan work. The public estimate of official life has been raised. Office is being more and more regarded as a public trust. The cause of public-school education has been greatly advanced. Hence sounder principles and superior candidates have become more necessary to party success.

JOHN T. DOYLE.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXCVII.

DECEMBER, 1889.

THE QUESTION OF DIVORCE.

BY THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, THE HON. JOSEPH P. BRADLEY, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, AND SENATOR JOSEPH N. DOLPH.

I UNDERTAKE, though not without misgiving, to offer answers to your four questions.* For I incline to think that the future of America is of greater importance to Christendom at large than that of any other country; that that future, in its highest features, vitally depends upon the incidents of marriage; and that no country has ever been so directly challenged as America now is to choose its course definitively with reference to one, if not more than one, of the very greatest of those incidents.

The solidity and health of the social body depend upon the soundness of its unit. That unit is the family; and the hinge of the family is to be found in the great and profound institution of marriage. It might be too much to say that a good system of marriage law, and of the practice appertaining to it, of itself insures the well-being of a community. But I cannot doubt that the converse is true; and that, if the relations of husband and wife are wrongly comprehended in what most belongs to them, either as to law or as to conduct, no nation can rise to the fulfil-

* The questions submitted as a basis for the discussion of the subject of Divorce, begun in the November number of THE REVIEW, are reprinted for the convenience of the reader. They are as follows:

1. Do you believe in the principle of divorce under any circumstances?
2. Ought divorced people to be allowed to marry under any circumstances?
3. What is the effect of divorce on the integrity of the family?
4. Does the absolute prohibition of divorce where it exists contribute to the moral purity of society?

ment of the higher destinies of man. There is a worm in the gourd of the public prosperity; and it must wither away.

I. On the first of the four questions I have to observe that the word divorce appears to be used in three different senses. First, it is popularly applied to cases of nullity, as in the world-famous suit of Henry VIII. This sense has only to be named in order to be set aside, since the finding of nullity simply means that, in the particular case, no contract of marriage has ever been made.

The second sense is that which is legally known, in canonical language, as divorce *a mensâ et toro*—from board and bed; and which is termed in the English statute of 1857 judicial separation. The word is employed apparently in this sense by our Authorized Version of the Bible (Matt. v., 32). The Revised Version substitutes the phrase "put away." The question now before me appears to speak of a severance which does not annul the contract of marriage, nor release the parties from its obligations, but which conditionally, and for certain grave causes, suspends their operation in vital particulars. I am not prepared to question in any manner the concession which the law of the church, apparently with the direct authority of St. Paul (1 Cor. vii., 10), makes in this respect to the necessities and the infirmities of human nature.

II. The second question deals with what may be called divorce proper. It resolves itself into the lawfulness or unlawfulness of remarriage, and the answer appears to me to be that remarriage is not admissible under any circumstances or conditions whatsoever.

Not that the difficulties arising from incongruous marriage are to be either denied or extenuated. They are insoluble. But the remedy is worse than the disease.

These sweeping statements ought, I am aware, to be supported by reasoning in detail; which space does not permit, and which I am not qualified adequately to supply. But it seems to me that such reasoning might fall under the following heads:

That marriage is essentially a contract for life, and only expires when life itself expires.

That Christian marriage involves a vow before God.

That no authority has been given to the Christian Church to cancel such a vow.

That it lies beyond the province of the civil legislature, which, from the necessity of things, has a *veto* within the limits of reason upon the making of it, but has no competency to annul it when once made.

That according to the laws of just interpretation remarriage is forbidden by the text of Holy Scripture.

[I would here observe:

1. That the declarations of the Gospels of St. Mark (x., 4), and St. Luke (xvi., 18), and of St. Paul (1 Cor. vii., 10) make no exception whatever.

That the language of St. Matthew prohibits absolutely the remarriage of a woman divorced or put away (*apolelumenēn*, not *tēn apolelumenēn*).

3. That the reservation found in St. Matthew only is reasonably to be referred to the special law of Moses, or what is here termed *porneia*.]

That, although private opinions have not been uniform even in the West, the law of the Latin Church, and also of the Anglican Church, from time immemorial, allows of no remarriage.

[Divorce with liberty to remarry was included in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* under Edward VI.; but that code never received sanction. In all likelihood it was disapproved by Queen Elizabeth and her advisers.]

That divorce proper, without limitation, essentially and from the time of contraction onwards, alters the character of marriage, and substitutes a relation different in ground and nature.

That divorce with limitation rests upon no clear ground either of principle or of authority.

[In England it was urged, on behalf of the bill of 1857, that adultery broke the marriage-bond *ipso facto*. Yet when the adultery is of both the parties, divorce cannot be given! Again, it is said that the innocent party may remarry. But (1) this is a distinction unknown to Scripture and to history, and (2) this innocent party, who is commonly the husband, is in many cases the more guilty of the two.]

That divorce does not appear to have accompanied primitive marriage. In Scripture we hear nothing of it before Moses. Among the Homeric Achaians it clearly did not exist. It marks degeneracy and the increasing sway of passion.

III. While divorce of any kind impairs the integrity of the family, divorce with remarriage destroys it root and branch. The parental and the conjugal relations are "joined together" by the hand of the Almighty no less than the persons united by the marriage tie to one another. Marriage contemplates not only an

absolute identity of interests and affections, but also the creation of new, joint, and independent obligations, stretching into the future and limited only by the stroke of death. These obligations where divorce proper is in force lose all community, and the obedience reciprocal to them is dislocated and destroyed.

IV. I do not venture to give an answer to this question except within the sphere of my own observations and experience, and in relation to matters properly so cognizable. I have spent nearly sixty years at the centre of British life. Both before and from the beginning of that period absolute divorces were in England abusively obtainable, at very heavy cost, by private acts of Parliament; but they were so rare (perhaps about two in a year) that they did not affect the public tone, and for the English people marriage was virtually a contract indissoluble by law. In the year 1857 the English Divorce Act was passed, for England only. Unquestionably, since that time, the standard of conjugal morality has perceptibly declined among the higher classes of this country, and scandals in respect to it have become more frequent. The decline, as a fact, I know to be recognized by persons of social experience and insight who in no way share my abstract opinions on divorce. Personally, I believe it to be due in part to this great innovation in our marriage laws; but in part only, for other disintegrating causes have been at work. The mystery of marriage is, I admit, two profound for our comprehension; and it seems now to be too exacting for our faith.

The number of divorces *a vinculo* granted by the civil court is, however, still small in comparison with that presented by the returns from some other countries.

W. E. GLADSTONE.

IN REPLY to the questions submitted by the editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, I would briefly say:

As marriage and the family institution constitute the foundation and chief corner-stone of civil society, it is of the greatest moment that the marriage-tie should never be dissolved save for the most urgent reason. I cannot assent, however, to the doctrine that it should never be dissolved at all. Mere separation, though legalized, would often be an inadequate and unjust remedy to the injured party, who would thus be subjected to an enforced celibacy. This might suit the notions of those who regard celi-

bacy as a virtue, but would fail to approve itself to those who take a wider and more charitable view of human nature.

The divine law which says, "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder," immediately adds an exception, "save for the cause of fornication"; showing—what the law of nature dictates—that the case is not governed by any iron rule of universal application. The law, "Thou shalt not kill," has its necessary exceptions, a disreguard of which would render it mischievous in a high degree. I know no other law on the subject but the moral law, which does not consist in arbitrary enactments and decrees, but is adapted to our condition as human beings. This is so, whether it is conceived of as the will of an All-Wise Creator, or as the voice of Humanity, speaking from its experience, its necessities, and its higher instincts. And that law surely does not demand that the injured party to the marriage-bond should be forever tied to one who disregards and violates every obligation which it imposes; to one with whom it is impossible to cohabit; to one whose touch is contamination. Nor does it demand that such injured party, if legally free, should be forever debarred from forming other ties through which the lost hopes of happiness for life may be restored. It is not reason, and it cannot be law, divine or moral, that unfaithfulness, or wilful and obstinate desertion, or persistent cruelty of the stronger party, should afford no ground for relief. The most rigid creeds to the contrary have found methods of dispensation from the theoretical rule. And if no redress be legalized, the law itself will be set at defiance; and greater injury to soul and body will result from clandestine methods of relief.

Yet so desirable is the indissolubility of marriage as an institution, so necessary is it to the happiness of families and the good of society, so pitiable the consequences that often flow from a dissolution, that every discouragement to such a remedy should be interposed. Not only should the judge take every care to see that just cause exists, but that no other remedy is possible. No jugglery or privacy should be tolerated, however high in station the parties may be. Investigation of the truth should be thorough and open, and should be a matter of public concern, participated in by the public representative of the law. It should be regarded as a *quasi-criminal* process, if not accompanied with criminal sanctions. Only serious and even severe methods of administer-

ing the law will be sufficient to repress the growing tendency of discontented parties to rush into the divorce courts.

I think an answer to all your questions is involved in these brief remarks.

J. P. BRADLEY.

MY OPINION is asked in answer to the following questions :

First—Should divorced people be allowed to remarry under any circumstances ?

Considering the interests of the public, which should be paramount in divorce laws, *Yes*, under all circumstances where the parties are neither incompetent to enter into another marriage contract nor incapacitated for performing their marital obligations. As there should be no partial divorce, which leaves the parties in the condition aptly described by an eminent jurist "as a wife without a husband and a husband without a wife," so, as a matter of public expediency and in the interest of public morals, whenever and however the marriage is dissolved, both parties, with the exceptions stated above, should be left free to remarry.

If punishment of the guilty party is necessary, some other method should be adopted. Punishment should be reformatory in its character and consistent with the interests of society. No prohibition and no law can change the instincts or control the passions, and prohibition of remarriage is likely to injure society more than the remarriage of the guilty party would. Such a prohibition is without effect except in the territorial limits of the prohibiting State, and is, therefore, of no practical value.

But considered merely as a punishment, and admitting that, having misbehaved in one matrimonial alliance, the guilty party has no claim to be protected in another, prohibition of remarriage would, in my opinion, be in many instances an unwise punishment. Take the case of a man divorced for habitual drunkenness, who has thoroughly reformed ; of one divorced after sentence of imprisonment for life, who is afterward pardoned ; of one convicted of felony, who has again won his way to public confidence ; and even of a man or woman divorced on account of the most flagrant offence against the marriage relation, who is again treading the paths of virtue;—is not a punishment which dooms such persons to perpetual celibacy greater than it should be ?

Second—What is the effect of divorce upon the integrity of the family?

Of course, by integrity as used here "moral soundness" is meant. The question does not appear to refer expressly to collusive divorces and divorces obtained for insufficient causes under loose and liberal legislation or lax administration of the divorce laws in some States, but to divorces in general.

Whether a particular divorce promotes or injures the moral soundness of the family must depend entirely upon the circumstances of the case, the cause for which the divorce is granted, and the condition of the children, if any, before and after the divorce. A divorce may be a great injury to the moral welfare of the children, or it may be the only way to promote that welfare. It is evident, if one or both of the parents are unfit to have the custody of the children, and the influence of home is corrupting, that their moral, as well as their educational and financial, interests can be better cared for by the innocent party, freed from the interference of the guilty one, or by strangers under the direction of a Court of Chancery. Divorce for proper causes, free from fraud and collusion, conserves the moral integrity of the family.

No one can overestimate the importance of the family relation and the influence of home upon the rising generation. The family is the foundation of organized society; the institution upon which more than upon all others the character, prosperity, and stability of a nation depend. Let it be corrupted, and the influence which it exerts upon the young be for evil, and the best system of public instruction and the wisest legislation cannot repair the injury to society caused thereby.

The marital union should continue for life. The parties to it should faithfully perform the duties and scrupulonsly keep the obligations of the contract, that the institution may answer the ends for which it was designed—secure the happiness and promote the welfare of the parties to it, and the proper training of the offspring of the union. But suppose that by the misconduct of one of the parties the legitimate ends of marriage are frustrated, the happiness of the parties wrecked, and the influence of the home upon the children perverted until it is only evil. Which is wiser—to render the contract indissoluble, require the continuance of a legal union, with the misery and evil influences it perpetuates, or to relieve the innocent party of the burden of such a

union, and place the children in the custody and under the care of those who will train them under better influences? Unquestionably the latter. There are many cases in which it is better for all concerned that the marital union should be dissolved, and in which the moral integrity of the family and the well-being of society are better conserved by a divorce than without it.

Prohibition of divorce can neither restore the bonds of affection, compel the actual union of husband and wife, nor restrain from infractions of the moral law. The difficult question is to determine what circumstances render divorce better in the interests of good government than the continuance of the marital relation. This should be the crucial test of all divorce legislation.

Third—Does the absolute prohibition of divorce where it exists contribute to the moral purity of society?

To answer this question as it should be answered would require more research than is possible with the limited time at my disposal. If the question were to be determined by a comparison of the condition of society in countries where divorces are permitted with that in which marriage is or has been held to be indissoluble, the question must be answered in the negative. Family morals in the United States, England, and Germany will certainly compare favorably with those in France, Spain, and Italy.

But a fairer comparison, where the other influences affecting the moral purity of society are more nearly equal, is made by Bishop in his valuable work upon "Marriage and Divorce." It is between South Carolina, where, until after the Rebellion at least, no divorces were allowed for any cause, and the States of the Union where divorces are allowed. The legislation and judicial decisions cited by him show a condition of things which might have been expected where divorce was prohibited. The proportion of his property which a married man might give to his concubine was regulated by law; and from the highest tribunal of the State the following vigorous protest against laws which prohibited divorce and at the same time punished adultery was made. In Cusack *v.* White, 2 Mill, 279, Judge Nott said:

"In this country, where divorces are not allowed for any cause whatever, we sometimes see men of excellent characters unfortunate in their marriages, and virtuous women abandoned or driven away houseless by their husbands, *who would be doomed to celibacy and solitude if they did not form connections which the law does not allow, and who make excellent husbands and virtuous wives still.* Yet they are considered as living in adultery, because a rigorous and unyielding law, from motives of policy alone, has ordained it so."

It does not appear that where divorce is refused it has prevented the wrongs for which divorces are granted in other countries. If parties who cannot or will not live together are not permitted to dissolve in law the bonds already sundered in fact, experience shows that they will form unlawful connections, and that public sentiment will largely justify them. The legislation that does most to discourage such connections, and to substitute for them legalized unions of the sexes, does most to promote moral purity.

There is much truth in the saying of an eminent French statesman in reference to prohibition of divorce, that

"laws to be obeyed must not do too great violence to our nature, which is always able to avenge itself upon the despotism of the law, either by crime, which is a violent reaction, or by corruption, which is a still but continued protest against despotism."

Fourth—What steps are necessary to procure a practical measure of reform ?

This is the important question. Opinions are and will always be divided concerning the matters embraced in the preceding questions. Divorces will continue to be granted and prohibition against the marriage of the guilty party will continue to be, as it now is, exceptional. But a great majority of the thinking people of this country recognize the evils growing out of lax laws concerning divorce and careless administration of them, and the necessity for reform. The evils to be remedied may be stated in a general way as follows :

1. Laws authorizing divorce for insufficient causes, upon insufficient residence of the parties, and insufficient notice to the defendant.

2. Lax administration by the courts of the laws concerning divorce, admitting of collusion and fraudulent divorces.

3. Want of uniformity in the laws of the several States prescribing causes for divorce, concerning the residence of the parties and notice to the defendant, and in judicial decisions as to the force and effect of a decree dissolving the marriage contract.

The result of this lax and diverse legislation and loose administration of the laws is that parties who wish to avoid the more stringent laws of one State migrate to a State where divorce is easy, for the sole purpose of securing a dissolution of the marriage contract for causes, and upon notice and testimony, which would be insufficient in the State of their actual residence. The number of

divorces continues to increase, many of which, held to be valid in the States where obtained, would be declared fraudulent and void in other States, and marriages by the divorced parties held to be legal in the States where the divorce was granted would be held to be bigamous elsewhere. If it is the husband who secures a divorce and remarries, the personal status of two women and the property rights of two families are involved. The first wife is still the lawful wife entitled to dower in the real estate of her husband in the State in which the first marriage was entered into, and probably in every other State except the one in which the fraudulent divorce was obtained. The second wife is entitled to dower under the laws of the State in which her marriage took place, and the children by that marriage are legitimate in that State, but elsewhere they are illegitimate and their mother is not entitled to dower.

What can be done to remedy these evils? The same steps are required that are necessary to secure legislative reform upon any other subject—agitation of the question, education of the people to bring about a healthy public sentiment, and a more careful administration of the existing laws in the several States, to secure legislation by the States limiting and more carefully defining the causes for divorce, providing better safeguards against imposition upon the court, and, as far as possible, uniformity in the laws of the several States, and the enacting by Congress of a stringent and uniform law upon the subject for the District of Columbia and the Territories.

But whatever may be accomplished in this manner, there will exist, as long as each State has the power to legislate for itself upon the subject, a want of uniformity in the laws of the several States, from which great inconvenience and confusion of personal and property rights will arise. We now have forty-two States. The population of all of them is composed of men and women of varying shades of opinion upon social questions; and the sentiment of the people of the different States, in the nature of things, is and will continue to be diverse upon the subject of divorce, making it inevitable that there shall be a corresponding diversity in the laws concerning it.

A most important measure of reform, at least a step greatly simplifying the problem, would be the adoption of an amendment to the Federal Constitution granting to Congress power to legislate upon the subjects of marriage and divorce. It is the right

and duty of the State to prescribe the qualifications of parties to the marriage contract, the manner in which it shall be solemnized and authenticated, the causes for which it may be set aside or annulled, and the effect of the dissolution upon the personal status and property rights of the parties and their children ; but there is nothing in the structure of our government to prevent this power being conferred upon the Federal Government.

Which shall legislate upon the subject, the States or the Federal Government, is a mere question of public convenience and welfare. A diversity in the laws on these subjects between independent nations gives rise to comparatively little confusion; but the relations between the States of the Union are entirely different from those between such nations. A citizen of the United States may be a resident to-day of one State and to-morrow of another ; but his change of residence should be without change or impairment of his rights of citizenship or of his personal or property rights.

A recent writer upon the subject of divorce considers the securing of an amendment to the Federal Constitution empowering Congress to legislate upon marriage and divorce impracticable; and it may prove to be so. It certainly is encompassed with difficulties. The same writer seems to think that it is practicable to secure uniformity of legislation upon the subject in the several States by agreement. But if the proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution is impracticable, a scheme for securing uniform legislation through the coöperation of the States is visionary. The one plan requires the consent of all the States, and promises no permanency, while the other requires the consent of only three-fourths of the States, and if accomplished would be permanent. Even if concert of action by State legislatnres could be secured, the uniformity could not be preserved, as one cannot bind another.

The difficulties of securing such an amendment are not as great as have been imagined. The feeling of antagonism between the Federal and State governments is largely dying out. As a rule, however proud the citizen is of his State, he is quite as proud of being a citizen of the United States. However jealous he is of the rights of his State, he is quite as much so of the rights of his greater country, which embraces all the States and exercises its legitimate powers over every foot of territory and upon every citizen of the Union. Let it be clearly shown that Congress can best legislate in the interests of the whole people

upon the subject, and the people and their representatives, the legislative assemblies, can be trusted to authorize it.

The objections to such an amendment have been magnified. It has been claimed that, if Congress is empowered to legislate upon the subject of marriage and divorce, "it will eventually absorb all the powers incidental to the subject." Congress could exercise only such express powers as were granted by the amendment, and powers necessarily implied in the express grant. It is true that the United States courts would have jurisdiction to enforce the laws which Congress might enact under such an amendment. That jurisdiction, however, would extend only to cases brought under those laws, and to cases in which some question arising under them was involved. Such an amendment would not, as has been supposed, confer upon Congress or the United States courts jurisdiction over the other relations of "husband and wife," over the relations of "parent and child," of "dower and courtesy," of "the law of descent," or of "the law of distribution." Jurisdiction on these subjects would be left where it now is—with the States. Divorces might be left to the State courts, if neither party chose to resort to the Federal tribunals.

But suppose such an amendment would involve the surrender by the States of jurisdiction of all the matters claimed by those who oppose such amendment. That would not necessarily be an argument against its adoption. The real question would still be whether it would be better for the whole people of the United States, in order to secure uniformity in the laws regulating marriage and divorce, and in the status and property rights of divorced parties and their children, that the Federal Government should possess the additional power proposed by the amendment. The Constitution was wisely framed, and was well adapted to the purposes for which it was intended at the time it was adopted; but to contend that it is too sacred to be amended in any particular is absurd. It was the creature of the people; it is subject to change when they will it. Provision was wisely made for its amendment as experience should dictate. Amendments may be proposed by Congress, but their adoption rests alone with the States. An amendment which secures the concurrence of three-fourths of the States must represent the will of the large majority of the people of the Union who are to be governed by it, and has a strong presumption of merit in its favor.

J. N. Dolph.

A REPLY TO MR. EDISON.

BY GEORGE WESTINGHOUSE, JR., PRESIDENT OF THE WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC COMPANY.

No one will now question the great benefit of the electric light to the public. By the rays of the brilliant arc lamp our streets are better lighted than ever before, with a corresponding increase in security both to life and property, while the incandescent lamp supplies our homes with the most agreeable artificial illumination known to science, and one which, at the same time, is absolutely free from the deleterious products of combustion incident to the use of gas or oil.

The use of electricity for supplying light and power has now become as much a part of our every-day life as the railway, the steamship, the street-car, or the gas supply. In fact, we live in a time when power is made in every way subservient to the comfort of the people. It is employed in nearly every useful industry, with a full knowledge that such employment has been and always must be attended with an appreciable degree of danger. Electricity is one manifestation of power. It represents a form of mechanical energy capable of being utilized for innumerable purposes. Indeed, were it a question of prohibiting the use not merely of electricity, but of all other things dangerous to life, we would no longer have fires to warm us or light to enable us to see, and, in fact, would be deprived of most of the necessaries and comforts of existence. As has been the case with the utilization of all other forms of energy, the demand for the most economical methods will ultimately prevail, provided these can be made safe, as they most certainly can, by the exercise of proper precautions.

Electric lighting, unlike many other industries protected by patents, has been followed with keen interest at every step by the public at large, but among more immediately interested par-

ties the struggle for the control of the electric light and power business has never been exceeded in bitterness by any of the historical commercial controversies of a former day. Thousands of persons have large pecuniary interests at stake, and, as might be expected, many of them view this great subject solely from the stand-point of self-interest. That the public may to some extent understand the mass of literature now being printed with reference to the use of electric currents of both high and low tension, it is necessary that something of the story of this business rivalry should be told.

The successful use of the Jablochkoff electric light in Paris, in 1878, was the beginning of a new era in a field which had not remained wholly uncultivated during the preceding thirty years, although with unimportant commercial results. In 1877 and 1878 we find William E. Sawyer, Charles F. Brush, Hiram S. Maxim, Edward Weston, Thomas A. Edison, and others entering this alluring field of invention. In 1877 Sawyer took out three patents of more than ordinary importance in view of what has since become the practice in electric lighting. Early in 1878 he associated with himself Albon Man, who became a joint inventor with him of several electric-lighting inventions, the promising results from which led to the formation, on July 8 of that year, of the Electro-Dynamic Light Company of New York. The objects for which this company was formed were stated as follows:

"The production of light and power by means of electricity; the lighting of streets, buildings, and other places; producing, conducting, and distributing electrical currents for lighting and other purposes, and the manufacture and sale of all machinery necessary for or adapted to accomplish the purposes named."

Charles F. Brush early invented and perfected a dynamo, an arc lamp, and a method of operation whereby a number of such arc lamps could be used on one circuit, principally for street-lighting purposes. To make and sell Mr. Brush's inventions, there was organized the Brush Electric-Light Company, of Cleveland, Ohio.

In September, 1878, appeared the first announcement of Mr. Edison's discoveries in electric lighting, and on October 17, three months after the formation of the Electro-Dynamic Company to operate Sawyer and Man's electric-light inventions, the Edison Electric-Light Company, of New York, was organized. To introduce the inventions of Maxim and Weston, there was formed the

United States Electric-Lighting Company, of New York, and thus four large corporations were started almost simultaneously upon a career of competitive business. The energy and money since expended by each of these corporations in efforts to thwart the progress of the others has mutually embittered the interested parties to a degree that can with difficulty be comprehended by those not immediately concerned in the strife.

Mr. Edison, already a well-known inventor in telegraphy, apparently had his attention drawn to this subject by a visit to Mr. William Wallace, of Ansonia, Conn., in September, 1878. There he saw Mr. Wallace's dynamos feeding eight electric lights at one time, and also witnessed the transmission of power by electricity from the Naugatuck River, a quarter of a mile distant. The spirit in which he entered the electric-light business would seem to be indicated in the following extract from the New York *Tribune* of September 28, 1878:

"Mr. Wallace's machines produce electricity which can be made available for electric light." Mr. Edison continued: "I have let the other inventors get the start of me in this matter somewhat, because I have not given much attention to electric lights, but I believe I can catch up to them now." . . . "Now that I have a machine (Wallace's) to make the electricity, I can experiment as much as I please." "I think," he added, smiling, "there is where I can beat the other inventors, as I have so many facilities here for trying experiments." "If you can make the electric light supply the place of gas, you can easily make a great fortune," the reporter suggested. "I don't care so much for a fortune," Mr. Edison replied, "as I do for getting ahead of the other fellows."

Setting out with this determination, it is perhaps no wonder he has worked so energetically. Reviewing his inventions and utterances, it is evident that he believed from the beginning that the system of gas-distribution was the thing to be copied, and that electric conductors could be laid under the streets with branches or connections to each house, supplied by generators located in central stations; but this system necessitated the limitation of the electric pressure to that which the lamps could be made to endure—in practice about 110 volts. The formidable quantities of copper required to conduct the necessary volume of current at this low pressure soon led to the development of what is known as the Edison "three-wire" system of distribution, an improvement founded upon earlier patents of Sawyer and Brush. This system permits a pressure of 220 volts on a circuit equipped with 110-volt lamps, and requires for the whole installation only

one-quarter of the weight of copper conductors necessary with the two-wire system.

It must be constantly borne in mind that the pressure of this direct-current system is necessarily limited to 220 volts by the conditions of the lamp, and also that the underground mains in all directions are interconnected, forming what is termed a mesh-work, analogous to the gas-distribution system, but with very important differences, hereafter explained at length. The cost of copper required for mains of sufficient conductivity to avoid a decrease in light by reason of large consumption, even at moderate distances, was found to be prohibitive, and this fact necessitated a system of "feeders," through which the electricity is forced against a very considerable resistance. These feeders are connected at various points to the mesh-work of mains so as to maintain at such points an approximately constant pressure. The generators at the central stations deliver their product collectively into common feeders and mains, and with a large plant an enormous energy is constantly exerted in these mains.

Any plan of distribution involving the meshing of the mains underneath the streets, with all house wires connected directly thereto, is regarded by the majority of competent electrical engineers as in many respects radically defective; so defective, in fact, that, unless the use of alternating currents can be prohibited, it seems destined to be wholly supplanted by the more scientific and in all respects (so far as concerns the users or occupants of buildings) far safer inductive system. Apparently sensible of this, Mr. Edison does not hesitate to say: "My personal desire would be to prohibit entirely the use of alternating currents."

The fact that the shocking accident which has given rise to the present discussion was, in all probability, the result of a direct continuous current, and that the burning of the unfortunate victim may have resulted from a low-tension current used for telegraphic or power purposes, apparently does not deter Mr. Edison from his self-imposed task of proving the low-pressure system to be the only safe one. It is, nevertheless, a common practice of the Edison Company to use uninsulated overhead wires for its 220-volt current for the purpose of economizing first cost, although it is well known that such a current is capable of burning a body subjected to it as effectually as in the case of lineman Feeks, provided the skin be sufficiently abraded to diminish the electrical resistance of the subject.

Accepting Mr. Edison's classification of the currents used for electric lighting, let us discuss them as follows :

"*First*—The low-tension continuous current, with a pressure not exceeding 200 volts, used for incandescent lighting.

"*Second*—The high-tension continuous current, with a pressure of 2,000 volts and over.

"*Third*—The high-tension semi-continuous, or pulsatory, current, with a pressure of 2,000 volts and over.

"*Fourth*—The alternating current, with a pressure of from 1,000 to 3,000 volts and over."

The first is not dangerous when a person comes into momentary contact with one wire, but no one can endure its passage through the body when the contact is made "in the most effective manner." I have witnessed the roasting of a large piece of fresh beef by a direct continuous current of less than one hundred volts within two minutes. Any one having access to electric lights operated by the low-tension underground system in New York can easily prove to his own satisfaction how much credence ought to be given to the assertion that a current of 200 volts can be passed through the human body without producing uncomfortable sensations. Let him connect a tin pan to one of the electric wires, and place therein a thick piece of beef, and upon this a gridiron of metal connected to the other wire. The electrical energy exhibited in the steaming and cooking of this beef may possibly surprise the experimenter. If the current is from an underground main, the experiment may be varied by connecting the gridiron to a water-pipe with like results. With even less than one hundred volts it is painful beyond endurance to press firmly with the hands the brushes or any bright brass-work of the dynamo, or to grasp any metal connected with the wires.

That a continuous current of moderate tension may produce death when the connection is continued for even a short time is shown by the published record of experiments conducted by Mr. A. E. Kennelly at the Edison Laboratory. With a continuous current of 400 volts a dog weighing fifty-seven and a half pounds was killed in forty seconds ; and in another instance, with 1,000 volts of continuous current, a dog weighing thirteen and a half pounds was killed instantly. That an alternating current of one hundred volts, even when effectively applied, does not kill is shown by two experiments on another dog. A continuous current of 304 volts was applied for thirty seconds, and then an alternating current of one hundred volts for sixty-five seconds ; yet the dog was unhurt.

But mark this important fact: the so-called "alternating current" used for these experiments on animals was not the alternating current of commerce, but was an Edison direct continuous current made alternating by a "pole-changer," producing an effect incomparably more dangerous than the true alternating current under discussion, because of the exaggerated tension resulting from the partial discharge of the field-magnets of the dynamo, which act in this case like a Ruhmkorf coil of enormous dimensions.

The power of destruction residing in the low-tension current under certain conditions is best illustrated by quoting from Mr. Edison's own article, where he says:

"Near the corner of William and Wall Streets, New York, the underground conductors of the Edison Illuminating Company became crossed, and the current which was passing through them at a pressure of only one hundred and ten volts melted not only the wires, but several feet of iron tubing in which they were incased, and reduced the paving-stones within a radius of three or four feet to a molten mass."

He adds: "This system is so arranged that consumers are not affected by such accidents as these." But it is, nevertheless, true that every consumer is directly connected to the mains, so that it is evident that the reverse of this statement would have more truly represented the actual possibilities of the case.

Concerning the three other conditions of current referred to by Mr. Edison, he classes them, and rightly so, as dangerous to life, although momentary contacts have repeatedly been made with wires carrying 1,000 and even 2,000 volts of each of these currents, without fatal results. In fact, there have been hundreds of cases in which momentary contact with an alternating current of 1,000 volts and over, as well as with pulsatory and continuous currents, has resulted only in painful shocks, unaccompanied by permanent injury.

The reader of Mr. Edison's article who is unfamiliar with the alternating system of distribution would naturally infer that in practice the same voltage is carried on the house wires as on the mains, as in the Edison system; but such is never the case under any circumstances. In this complete disconnection of the street and house wires is found the reason of the positive safety both to life and property enjoyed by the users of the alternating system. It is one of the great advantages of this system that it admits of the use of high voltages for the street mains, and of wholly separate and independent currents, with absolutely

safe voltage, for all wires within buildings—a condition which is infallibly secured and maintained by converters, or transformers, located in or near each building. Each transformer of electric energy is composed of two separately-wound and insulated coils, one of thin wire connected to the street mains, and the other of thick wire connected to the wires of the building. One of the most beautiful features of the alternating system is that when currents of electricity are sent back and forth with almost inconceivable rapidity through the coil of thin wire, there is induced in a neighboring coil of thicker wire an equivalent amount of electrical energy, but at the same time so modified that the voltage, which may be 2,000 in the thin coil, need be only fifty in the thick coil, the volume of electricity being as many times increased as the pressure or voltage is diminished. A current of fifty volts is used in practice, as it is now well established that lamps of this capacity are far more durable and give a better light, with much greater economy, than the 100- or 110-volt lamps. The two coils being absolutely separated from each other by effective insulation through which the current in the primary wire cannot possibly penetrate, it follows that the alternating system has an enormous advantage over the direct system in respect of absolute safety to the consumer.

It seems possible that the time is not far distant when the regulations governing the distribution of electricity will rigidly prohibit direct electrical connection between the street wires and the local service-wires inside houses, thereby excluding from dwelling-places all the dangerous effects possible to ensue from accidental leakages in the underground system.

The forebodings of Mr. Edison concerning the results of the leakage of current from the underground mains have perhaps been in great part suggested by difficulties experienced in the working of his own system. The Edison underground lines are made up of a great number of short sections of iron pipe, each containing a copper rod, with a plastic insulating material forced between the copper and the iron. These sections are about sixteen feet long and are laid in trenches, and united at the joints like gas-pipes. These pipes are usually laid above the frost-line, and are necessarily affected by changes of temperature, which cause the iron pipes to move at the joints. It is, therefore, not unusual to find that after a short time the electrical leakage becomes sufficient to light a number of lamps when connection

is made between a water-pipe and one of the mains—a fact well known to insurance inspectors. The Edison Company continues to use this system, although cables are now made capable of withstanding 2,500 volts of either alternating or direct current with even greater security than Mr. Edison has been able to provide for the 220 volts employed in his low-tension system.

One of the most perfect cables of to-day is a copper wire covered with a thick insulation, over which lead is pressed with very great force, thereby expelling air and gases, and solidifying the insulating material between the lead and copper. There is then woven upon the lead a textile envelope saturated with a water- and gas-proof compound. The continuous sections of this cable reach from one man-hole to another, a distance of several hundred feet, and can easily be drawn in and out of the ducts provided for them. Where one piece of cable is joined to another, an electric connection is made and well insulated, then encased in lead, which is afterward soldered to the ends of the respective cables. A cable of this character is uninfluenced by changes of temperature and is subject to little deterioration. To guard against its being pierced by a spark of static electricity, a very simple device is attached to it, offering an easier path for the electricity than through the insulation.

One of the differences alluded to, as existing between the low-tension, continuous-current underground system and a gas-pipe system, is that with reference to leakage. A gas leak is local and incapable of producing effects at a distance. With electricity, however, the aggregate effects of all the leakages from an underground system may be suddenly concentrated at any point within that system, as by one of the house wires coming in contact with a metal pipe, and such a contact may result even from the work of a mouse; whereupon the leakage of the entire net-work, which may amount to a large percentage of the total current, will be concentrated, and the surrounding material affected (although perhaps to a less degree) in the manner described by Mr. Edison in the reference to the currents at the corner of William and Wall Streets.

The interconnection of the conductors for the purpose of reducing the original investment has, in another important respect, a contrary effect from the meshing of gas-mains. In the case of the latter, the fracture of a pipe at one place, while it may cause a considerable leak, does not necessarily extinguish the lights of

all the consumers. The grounding of one of the wires of an underground circuit, however, affects the entire mesh-work; and a cross between the wires may extinguish the lights of an entire district for a considerable time.

As to the accidents from electric currents, the records of deaths in the city of New York show that there were killed by street-cars during the year 1888, 64 persons; by omnibuses and wagons, 55; and by illuminating gas, 23; making the number killed by the electric current (5) insignificant compared with the deaths of individuals from any of the other causes named. The placing of the wires underground would eliminate many of the causes of accidents from electric currents, and they may all be prevented by the employment of reasonable and well-understood safeguards. Mr. Edison's statement that the putting of the wires underground will, instead of diminishing, increase the danger to life, is little less than amazing, at least when considered in connection with his advocacy of his own underground system. The repeated and violent explosions of gas in the man-holes of the Edison system, and in connection with the underground systems of the telephone and telegraph companies, have certainly shown that electricity from any source, either from low-tension electric-light, telephone, or telegraph currents, either of which is capable of producing a spark, may be the cause of a serious catastrophe, although there is no doubt that the accumulation of explosive mixtures within these chambers can be effectually prevented. Inasmuch as Mr. Edison's arguments against underground wires generally are equally applicable to his own system, it would seem, logically, that, if his views are to prevail, all electric wires must cease to serve the public. The experience of the cities of Chicago and Philadelphia in the use of underground cables for high-tension currents, to say nothing of the large number of cables laid underground in Rome, Berlin, Milan, and in other cities, indicates that the success of properly-constructed underground systems, whether for currents of high or low tension, has been established beyond question.

There is one radical difference between the alternating and the continuous low-tension system which should be fully understood. It has been shown that in the alternating system the street mains are absolutely disconnected and detached from the house mains, while the low-tension system necessitates the

meshing of all underground mains into one net-work and the supply of the current to that system by a series of feeders. In fact, it necessitates at times the supply of an enormous electrical energy to supply the demand. With the alternating system the practice is not to mesh the wires, but to run independent pairs of wires connecting the switch-board in the station with the thin wires of the converters. These wires are designed to supply only about 1,500 to 2,000 lights per pair, and are made of such a size that there is no appreciable decrease in the lights at the farther end, even if there is a very large consumption of current. Each of these pairs of mains can, therefore, be provided at the station with safety devices which will instantly and automatically cut off the current in the event of a cross-connection taking an abnormal current from the dynamo. Such safety devices cannot be made available with the low-tension system.

Mr. Edison is, moreover, unfortunate in his reference to the use of electric currents abroad. Under the British Electric-Lighting Act of 1888 the Board of Trade has issued a set of regulations. Concerning high-pressure conductors it says:

"9. *High-Pressure Conductors to be Insulated.* Every high-pressure aërial conductor must be continuously insulated with a durable and efficient material, to be approved by the Board of Trade, to a thickness of not less than one-tenth part of an inch, and in cases where the extreme difference of potential in the circuit exceeds 2,000 volts, the thickness of insulation must not be less in inches or parts of an inch than the number obtained by dividing the number expressing the volts by 20,000."

It will be seen that these regulations provide not merely for 2,000 volts, which is double that used in the American alternating system, but for any voltage whatsoever which the electric companies may desire to carry.

In a recent authorized publication it is stated that the main characteristics of the Edison system are as follows:

First—Subdivision of generating units to secure reliability and economy of production.

Second—Meshing of distributing conductors in a common net-work throughout the entire area to be supplied, to secure uniform distribution.

Third—A system of special feeding conductors to apportion equally the supply of energy to the demand throughout the area covered by the system of conductors.

Fourth—A system of indicators to denote in the station variations of pressure at any point in the area of consumption.

Fifth—A system of regulation to compensate for any variation of pressure.

The main characteristics of the alternating system contrast

with these in a marked manner. These characteristics may be stated as follows:

First—Large generators located in central stations at points convenient for coal and water supply, and away from residences.

Second—A series of mains running from the station, each set of mains having a capacity of not exceeding 1,500 lights, and each pair of mains extending to the station, so that the lines are only interconnected at the switch-board in the station.

Third—By reason of the limitation of the number of lights on each circuit, the leakage on any one circuit is reduced to a minimum.

Fourth—The interruption or burning-out of any one circuit can have no effect upon other circuits, the contrary being a most serious defect in a system wherein the wires are meshed.

Fifth—Absence of numerous and costly regulating contrivances.

Sixth—Ability to use within all houses a fifty-volt current, whereby the most efficient lamps can be utilized.

Seventh—Absolute separation of the street mains from the house mains, thereby preventing injury or danger from the leakage from the street mains.

Eighth—The use of a mechanical meter, which accurately records the entire electrical energy consumed in the house.

Ninth—The easy regulation of the current if required, so that the lights may be turned up and down without expensive and wasteful machinery.

There is not on record a solitary instance of a person having been injured or shocked from the consumers' current of an alternating system. This is wholly due to the fact that the converted current within the buildings supplied need not exceed fifty volts, and that the street mains and the house wires are absolutely detached from each other, so that there is no possibility of a shock being received from leakage or short-circuiting in the high-tension street mains.

The fire-risk from electricity is the one most to be feared. With the continuous current, whenever there is occasion to put out a number of lights by the movement of a switch, it not infrequently happens that a dazzling arc of blue flame is formed which has to be blown out. With the alternating system it is impossible to form any considerable arc, even if the switch controls a thousand lights, the rapid reversals of the current having the effect of preventing its establishment.

Mr. Edison's observations concerning the efforts of his competitors in the direction of saving in investment are no less applicable to the desires of the suppliers of his own system. At the annual convention of the Edison Illuminating Companies at Niagara, in August of this year, the following resolutions were offered by Mr. Gilbert, of the Detroit Edison Station:

"*Resolved*, That the Association respectfully call to the attention of the Edison General Electric Company the difficulties under which local companies are now laboring in consequence of the lack of

"1. An efficient and inexpensive arc-light system.

"2. An arc lamp which can be economically operated on the three-wire system.

"3. A flexible method of enlarging the territory which can be profitably covered

from their stations for domestic lighting *by higher pressures* and consequently *less outlay of copper* than that involved by the three-wire method.

"We earnestly appeal to the parent organization to supply these deficiencies."

The proceedings of the convention also contain the following:

"The address of Sir William Thomson, as president of the physical section of the British Association in 1882, contained this memorable passage: 'Nothing above 200 volts, on any account, ever should be admitted into a ship or house or other place where safeguards cannot be made absolutely and forever trustworthy against all possible accident.' This opinion accords with what Mr. Edison has always maintained—that in the long run every system will fail which does not (for domestic service) use a low-pressure current."

This is precisely what the alternating system supplies. The successful use of arc-lamps depends upon high voltages. Neither Mr. Edison nor any other person has yet been able to supply the requirements of the public by means of a low-tension arc-lighting system.

A careful consideration of the whole subject proves that it is possible to light all the buildings within a city by means of electricity distributed by an underground system, wherein there shall be no connection whatever between the underground system and the wires within the buildings. It has been demonstrated that an incandescent lamp operated by a fifty-volt current will give more light at a given cost than a 110-volt lamp; and, these two things being admitted, it follows that, if there are to be any restrictive regulations with reference to electric lighting, they might more properly be: *First*—That the electro-motive force within any building shall never exceed one hundred volts; *Second*—That no underground system shall be placed in electrical connection with the wires in the buildings; *Third*—That no underground system shall be permitted which does not provide for the renewal and repair of the mains without digging up the streets.

In conclusion it is worthy of note that for three years past the purchasers of apparatus for electric lighting, who are at perfect liberty to buy from any company, have, for the most part, preferred to use the alternating system, so that to-day the extension of that system for central-station incandescent lighting is at least five times as great as that of the direct current. If the opinion of these persons, who can have no interest except to purchase that which they believe to be the best, is of any value, then the alternating system has been demonstrated to be the one which can give to the public that which they so much desire—a safe, cheap, efficient, and universally-applicable system of incandescent electric lighting.

GEO. WESTINGHOUSE, JR.

REPUBLICAN TACTICS IN THE HOUSE.

BY THE HON. ROGER Q. MILLS, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM TEXAS.

As soon as it was known that the elections had given the present House to the Republican party, the leaders of that party began a systematic crusade against its rules of procedure. They have suddenly discovered that, instead of facilitating the majority in the despatch of such business as may meet their approval, the rules have thrown obstructions across their path that are always difficult, and sometimes impossible, to surmount. Recognizing the fact that party supremacy must depend upon public opinion, they have been persistently courting its approval of their charges, in order that they may have its support when they proceed to level the barriers in their way. No one questions the right of the majority to govern, nor their right to make the rules by which they propose to control the business of the parliamentary body.

The rules of the House are intended, primarily, to facilitate the despatch of business, but they are also intended, like other laws, to protect the weak against the strong. In the first paragraph of his parliamentary manual, Mr. Jefferson quotes with approval the language of Speaker Onslow, whom he characterizes as "the ablest among the Speakers of the House of Commons." Mr. Onslow said that the rules of proceeding, "as instituted by our ancestors, operated as a check and control on the actions of the majority," and that they were "in many instances a shelter and protection to the minority against the attempts of power." Mr. Jefferson adds:

"So far the maxim is certainly true, and is founded in good sense, that, as it is always in the power of the majority by their numbers to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted, as they were found necessary, from time to time, and are become the law of the House, by a strict adherence to which the

weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check, and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities."

Before these checks against irregularities and abuses are removed, it should be shown that the nature of power has changed, and that it is not now actuated by a spirit of wantonness. When that high standard of moral perfection is reached by Republican Congressmen, their Democratic opponents will throw no hindrances in the way of their progress.

The same argument now made against the rules of the House could be made with equal force against the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of all the States that compose the Union. All of these are but rules for the government of political societies; and in all of them there are obstructions thrown across the path the majority may wish to go. The founders of our government had been taught in the school of experience that the multitude clothed with unlimited power was as dangerous as the single despot; that arbitrary power was the same whether it resided in one or many. Therefore, to prevent those who were chosen to be law-makers from becoming law-breakers, they prescribed, in all the constitutions, boundaries beyond which they should not go. All these were useless precautions if majorities were not sometimes maddened by the lust of power and forgetful of the rights of the weaker party. In all these constitutions we see where the people, jealous for the preservation of their natural rights, have prohibited the government from interfering with the freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press. We see where they have forbidden the passage of *ex-post-facto* laws and bills of attainder, and prescribed boundaries to Congress in many other cases. All these are constitutional obstructions in the way of the majority. The history of the world in all ages and countries proved that these obstructions were necessary to secure the rights of freemen against the abuse of power.

The demand for the removal of the limitations in the rules means that the party in power are fatally bent on mischief; that they have some desperate enterprise on foot that their prophetic souls tell them is beyond the boundary of rightful jurisdiction, and that in carrying it out they will meet with stubborn opposition. It is not believed that they desire to create an establishment of religion, or to abridge the freedom of speech or of the press; but there is good ground to believe that the wantonness of

power has suggested to them the necessity of doing some things that are as palpable violations of the Constitution as these would be, though they may not be so pernicious. The excesses which they will attempt will be such as are dictated by a conviction of party necessity. The measures for which the way must be cleared are such as will, in their judgment, secure party ascendancy. If it can be done, the rules will be so framed that all opposition will be silenced when they are ready to vacate a Democratic seat and give it to a Republican contestant, regardless of the vote of the constituency. And there will be no "scandalous scenes" when they are trying to pass bills to create returning boards to give certificates of election to defeated Republican candidates for electors and members of Congress. It is to prepare the way for the advent of this higher civilization that the rules have been indicted and arraigned before the bar of public opinion.

It is gravely said that the rules which permit what is called filibustering should be changed so as to prevent the scandalous scene that occurred in the House in 1882. There are two sides to that picture, and both should be seen before a judgment is pronounced. Mr. Tillman, a Democrat, was elected to Congress from the Second District in South Carolina, in 1880, by a majority of 8,036 in a total of 38,614 votes, and a Republican House unseated him and gave the seat to the defeated candidate of their own party. Mr. O'Connor, a Democrat, was elected to Congress from the First District in the same State, at the same time, by a majority of 5,272 in a total of 29,866 votes. He died before Congress convened, and Mr. Dibble was elected to fill the vacancy. Mr. Dibble was unseated and the place was given to the defeated Republican candidate. Mr. Richardson, a Democrat, was elected to Congress at the same time, from the same State, by a majority of 8,468 in a total of 31,816 votes: the committee reported that his seat, too, should be given to the defeated Republican candidate, and the House was proceeding to carry the resolution into effect on the 3d of March, 1883, when the gavel fell announcing the expiration of the Congress, and the unhappy contestant fell just "outside the breastworks." While these resolutions unseating the Democratic Representatives were before the House, the minority indulged in parliamentary tactics to defeat them, and the country can decide whether the scandal attached to the majority, who were engaged in an effort to rob the constituencies of three dis-

tricts of the right of representation, or the minority, who were engaged in defending them.

It may be true that filibustering was never known in election cases prior to that time, but it is equally true that there was no cause to provoke it. From 1861 to 1875 the Republican party had the Congress, and they had returning boards in the South to give certificates of election to their defeated candidates. Democrats could not filibuster against their admission when they were already in. Sheridan and Lawrence were elected to the Forty-third Congress from Louisiana, but the returning boards of that State gave the certificates to Pinchback and Sypher. They retained the seats till the last day of the session, when, late at night, the unanimous report of the committee, that neither one of them was elected, was adopted and the two Democrats were sworn in. From 1875 to 1881 the Democrats had the House, and they seated Republican candidates when they were elected, and there was nothing to provoke factious opposition. Democrats ought not to be too severely criticised by their opponents for employing filibustering tactics, for the lesson was learned from the Republicans.

In 1854, when the Kansas-Nebraska Bill was before the House, the Republican minority alternated the two motions to adjourn and to fix the day to which the House should adjourn, and called the roll on them one hundred and thirty-eight times. This is the first time these motions were ever used in that way, and never before in the history of the government had any measure proposed in the House provoked such angry feeling or aroused such bitter opposition.

In the Forty-third Congress the Republican party adopted the Civil-Rights Bill and urged its passage through the House. It met the united and determined opposition of the Democratic members, who denounced it as a palpable violation of the Constitution; and, as the minority had no other means of protecting themselves against the reckless invasion of the majority, they employed the tactics adopted by the Republicans in 1854. Again the majority changed the rules. The gag was adopted. The bill was passed, but the Democratic position was sustained by the Supreme Court, which declared the law unconstitutional.

In 1877 there was another notable struggle by the minority to prevent the theft of the Presidency. An act of Congress was passed to change the existing rule for counting the electoral vote.

A commission was created to lift the contest out of the murky atmosphere of politics and into a higher and purer atmosphere of patriotism. But it was found that politics, and not patriotism, controlled the decisions of the commission, and that it was organized to avoid the obstructions that would otherwise have embarrassed the way to the executive chair. When the plan was uncovered and the cheat exposed, the filibustering method of opposition was again employed, but, as in the other cases mentioned, it was unsuccessful, and Mr. Hayes was declared President; and when he was inaugurated, he sustained the Democratic remonstrance by deciding that Louisiana had gone Democratic for all the officers from governor down, though the same returning board that declared a majority for him declared it for all the Republican candidates!

The Republicans again have a majority in the House, but not large enough to insure the success of their schemes. They have again extraordinary measures to be carried through, and the rules must again be subjected to their manipulations. They have gotten up seventeen contests for Democratic seats. These vacated and given to Republicans would give them a working majority large enough to place beyond the domain of doubt the passage of such laws as will materially aid in preserving and perpetuating their party ascendancy,

They readily see that there will be no difficulty in making a rule to prevent dilatory motions, and that the Speaker whom they will elect will refuse to entertain or put such motions to the vote. But the great difficulty in the way is the quorum which the Constitution requires to do business. A minority of one-fifth of those present may demand the yeas and nays, and when they are recorded they must show a majority of the House voting on the proposition. It will require in the present House one hundred and sixty-six members to make the constitutional quorum. This rule cannot be changed, and with a margin of three over the constitutional requirement it will be very difficult, in so large a body, to keep in their seats the indispensable number. There are at all times a large number of absentees from sickness, business, or other causes. The perplexing question that will not down is how to obtain a quorum if the minority sit still and refuse to vote. This question has often been before the House.

In 1832 a resolution was submitted by Mr. Bates, of Maine, to

censure Mr. Stanberry, of Ohio. Ex-President John Quincy Adams, who was then a member of the House, asked to be excused from voting on it. The House refused to excuse him, and Mr. Adams sat still when his name was called and refused to vote. Resolutions were offered and debated; inquiries were set on foot to discover the way to enforce the rule that required every member to vote; but it all resulted in sound and fury signifying nothing. They had "led the horse to water, but could not make him drink." The House, finding it beyond the power of a majority to compel the vote of a minority of one, dropped the whole subject, or, rather, laid it all on the table.

On the 24th of February, 1875, a motion was made in the House to reconsider a vote refusing to go into committee of the whole. The yeas and nays were taken, and the record showed that no quorum had voted. Among those present and not voting was the distinguished leader of the opposition, the Hon. Samuel J. Randall. Mr. Butler, of Massachusetts, said there was evidently a quorum in the House, and inquired of the Speaker if there was no way in which the House could compel a member to vote. The Speaker, Mr. Blaine, replied: "The chair knows of no way of making a horse drink, although you may lead him to water." Another member stated to the chair that Mr. Randall was in his seat and did not vote, and moved that he be compelled to vote. To this the Speaker replied: "If the gentleman will indicate any mode by which a member can be compelled to vote, the chair will be glad to enforce it." Mr. Butler attempted to show the chair the desired way, and offered a resolution that Mr. Randall be brought to the bar of the House to answer for contempt of its authority. The point was made that a quorum was required to adopt the resolution. Mr. Butler called upon the Speaker to declare the presence of a quorum, if he believed there was a quorum in the hall. The Speaker replied: "The chair cannot declare a quorum against a yea-and-nay vote." He said it would be an "utter absurdity" for the chair to put an opinion against a record on a roll-call. Mr. Coburn, of Indiana, proposed that, when the roll was being called and members were refusing to vote, the difficulty could be overcome by a member rising in his place and naming another as present and refusing to vote, and asking that a record should be made to show that fact. To that the Speaker replied: "The

very principle enunciated by the gentleman from Indiana has been the foundation, probably, for the greatest legislative frauds ever committed. The moment you clothe your Speaker with power to go behind your roll-call and assume that there is a quorum in the hall, why, gentlemen, you stand on the very brink of a volcano." Mr. Hawley, of Illinois, came to the relief of the bewildered majority, and asserted that he and every other member had the right to demand that every member should vote. The Speaker replied: "The chair denies that utterly." The chair repeatedly suggested to the majority the only solution of their troubles—that a majority of the House could transact business.

The remedy, therefore, was for the party entrusted by the people with the duties and responsibilities of legislation to remain in the House and make the quorum required by the Constitution. The responsibility is on the majority party to make the quorum, and instead of scolding the members of the minority for refusing to share in the responsibility of bad legislation, they should call their own delinquents to account for abandoning the post of duty.

There was a thorough revision of the rules of the House in 1879. The committee charged with the duty of overhauling the rules reported numerous amendments, all of which had the unanimous agreement of the whole. The gag, of course, was left out, as it had been taken out by the Democratic House in the previous Congress, and, not being in accord with the canons of Democratic faith, it was never restored in any of the Houses when they were in the majority. When the subject was taken up for consideration in the House, Mr. Tucker, of Virginia, who had grown weary of Republican filibustering, offered an amendment authorizing the Speaker to declare a quorum constituted whenever those voting and those present who declined to vote should together make a majority of the House. But his amendment met with so little encouragement from his own side, and such determined opposition from the Republicans, that he withdrew it to save it from defeat. Among those who spoke against it were Mr. Garfield, Mr. Conger, Mr. Hawley, of Connecticut, Mr. Robeson, and Mr. Reed. All of them concurred with Speaker Blaine that the majority party must make the quorum to do business; and that the majority of members present, when less than a quorum, can only compel the attendance of absentees, but can not compel the vote of a member.

But the question arises in the mind, Why is it more necessary now than formerly to level the barriers? What great evil is threatening? What great good is to be accomplished? It is not difficult to penetrate the thin disguise that covers the real object so carefully kept in the background. The Republican party, for the first time since 1874, has the administration and both branches of Congress. In that year they lost the House by an immense majority. Two years later they lost the administration and the Senate. By the aid of the returning boards and visiting statesmen, the majorities in Louisiana and Florida against the electors of their party were revised away through the rule of "addition, division, and silence," and they retained the administration by a bold and shameless fraud, while a majority of the popular vote, a majority of the electoral vote, and a majority of the States declared for the Democratic party. In 1880, with a large expenditure of "soap," they made their way slick enough to slide in. In 1884 the ballot-box again declared for the Democracy, but in 1888, by an immense outlay of the sinews of war, they have the administration, the Senate, and the House. Having control of the three branches of the law-making department, they feel the necessity of throwing fortifications around them, and making their hold on power so strong that the ballot-box cannot dislodge them. To do this, they must revive the old returning boards that throw out the Democratic votes, and in all cases where it is important give the certificate to the Republican, whether he is elected or not.

The measure they propose is bold and revolutionary, and it remains to be seen whether they will succeed in passing it, and, if it is passed, what the popular verdict will be when it comes to be enforced.

ROGER Q. MILLS.

A GOOD WORD FOR JEWS.

BY KARL BLIND.

AT A TIME when wretched fanatics of the Stöcker and Schönerer type once more try in Germany and Austria to rouse the worst crusading spirit against fellow-citizens of the "Semitic race," whose forefathers have lived in the same country with theirs for a thousand years and more, it is always pleasant to look upon a picture of nobler conduct in days of yore. Men are apt to speak of the early middle ages as of an epoch of unmitigated barbarism. Yet no fact stands out more clearly from the corresponding chapter of history than that Jews, especially in Germany, enjoyed then far greater toleration, far greater rights, than in the centuries which followed.

It was mainly the wars for the recovery of the so-called Holy Sepulchre which brought about the change for the worse in the sense of religious persecution. Even then it took some time before the populace could be egged on to the most fiendish atrocities; for, truth to say, its heart was *not* in the cause of the crusaders. From so unimpeachable a source as the Chronicle of the Abbot of Ursperg we know that when these militant salvationists gathered together during the reign of Konrad III., the first Hohenstaufen King and Emperor of Germany, they were publicly sneered at all along their route through the different towns. The Abbot expressly states that well-nigh the whole German nation (*omnis pene populus Teutonicus*) thought the crusaders were seized with an unheard-of folly, amounting to a delirium (*quasi inauditâ stultitiâ delirantes*). This sarcastic attitude of large masses continued for a long time. Hence the crowd of would-be deliverers of a mythical Holy Sepulchre had often to run the gantlet of jeers and gibes, in which the Papacy and the whole organization of the church made a public sport.

It was only by means of a continued system of terror that the Papacy then kept itself at its exalted height. This terror, however, was sometimes met by the firmest resistance. In the reign of the free-thinking Emperor Frederick II. of Germany (1215-1250), we find the notorious inquisitor, Konrad von Marburg, the forerunner of Hoogstraten, Torquemada, and other scourgers of heresy, busily engaged in purging Germany from reformatory aspirations. A reasonable state policy ought to have induced the Kaiser to put a stop to this infamous cruelty at once. In his own quarrels with the Pope, who employed against him the well-known language of wrathful theocracy, Frederick II. did not mince his expressions. He occasionally called the so-called vicegerent of God a "dirty priest," a "dragon," an "infernal beast"—words which were but counterblasts to Papal allocutions of equal strength. But all the while Frederick issued decrees for the persecution of the Waldenses, and allowed the inquisitorial agents of the Roman court to overrun the German kingdom for the purpose of burning heretics whose mild skepticism fell far short of his own advanced free thought. It was the Cæsarist vein in the gifted Emperor of the Swabian House, it was his jealousy of anything savoring of the independent, self-governing spirit of the people, which thus led him astray in practical politics.

Still, not only among the masses, but also among the landed aristocracy and the military knighthood of Germany, there was even then a strongly-developed anti-Papal tendency. Any one conversant with the political and anti-clerical part of our minnesinger literature knows that, three hundred years before Luther, this tendency found utterance in a number of lays almost as bold as anything written during the Reformation. Nor is the sequel of the policy of Frederick II., in the case of the Grand-Inquisitor Konrad von Marburg, less instructive. No government action being taken against the bloodthirsty priestly fiend, a number of knights one day simply fetched him out of his house, and then and there, with but scant formality, killed him like a mad dog. High-handed as the act was, Germany for a long time afterwards was not troubled any more by attempts to employ the practices of the Inquisition.

These rapid introductory remarks are made to give a truer picture of the popular mind of the early middle ages than is often to be found. The farther, moreover, we go back in that

epoch, the better it is seen that persecution of people of the Mosaic faith only began and grew in connection with the persecution of Christian heretics or free-thinkers by the Roman Church.

In a recent valuable work on "The History of the Educational System and the Culture of the Jews in France and Germany (X.–XIV. Century),"* by Dr. Güdemann, a rabbi at Vienna, it is correctly stated that the Germans, for a long period after their conversion to Christianity, were by no means hostile to the Jews as a race or a religious community. The Christian creed, it may be remembered, had made its way in large parts of Germany with some difficulty. It took a thirty-years' war before the Saxons were finally converted by the sword of Karl the Great amidst horrible cruelties, and deprived of their ancient rights of self-goverment. For generations many of the professed adherents of Christianity were still, at heart, scarcely weaned from the belief in Wodan, Thunar (Thor), and Frick, or Freia. Nature-worship in the forest, on the hill-top, on the river-side, at brooks, and on the sea-shore was deeply engraved in the Teutonic mind. And so long as this personification of the forces of Nature still had a strong hold upon popular fancy, the descendants of the exiles and emigrants from Palestine were comparatively free from molestation—nay, even often held in considerable esteem. This is a point clearly brought out by Dr. Güdemann's book.

For aught we know, many of the early German converts have thought the story of their own Goddess of Love and of Balder's death—if it was current among them in the form we know from the Edda—to be remarkably akin, in its main points, to the account contained in the Romanist's new faith. For that very reason they may have remained somewhat skeptical as to the alleged crime charged upon the Jews. Altogether our German forbears, during their heathen history, had distinguished themselves by a spirit of fairness toward those of another creed. There is no instance on record of a non-believer in the Teutonic religion having had to drink the cup of hemlock or to die on the cross for the sake of his faith. Recent excavations in eastern Germany have shown that foreign merchants, Phœnikian or Etruscan, were buried

**Geschichte des Erzichungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Frankreich und Deutschland (X.—XIV. Jahrhundert).* Von Dr. M. GÜDEMANN, Rabbiner und Prediger in Wien.

there, in gray antiquity, among our heathen ancestors, with the symbols of their own religion peacefully placed in their tomb.

"The first German Jews of whom authentic mention is made in history appear," as Dr. Güdemann phrases it, "at once in the best society." Karl the Great, though barbarously cruel against the Wodan-worshipping Saxons who resisted his imperial ambition and aggression, had a Jew of the name of Sedechias as his physician-in-ordinary. Among the ambassadors whom the powerful Frankish Kaiser sent to Harun Arraschid, or al Raschid, there was also a Jew of the name of Isaak. It was that "Semetic alien"—as some preachers of intolerance of our day might say—who chiefly aided in making the diplomatic mission a successful one. Furthermore, Karl the Great (Charlemagne, as the French call that Frankish Teuton conquerer) promoted Hebrew science in Germany by transplanting a Jewish family of scholars, Kalonymos, from Lucca to Mainz.

Again, the queen of Karl's son, Lewis the Pious, and many noble ladies of her court, were very favorable to the Jews. Highly-instructed Christian men of that time preferred the works of Philo and Josephus to the Gospels. Clerics themselves were often on the friendliest terms with Jews. Christians visited the synagogues, and declared that the sermons of the rabbis pleased them better than those of their own priests. Bodo, a priest at the imperial court, and another cleric, Wikelin, or Wicelinus, even became converts to the Mosaic faith. The latter went the length of justifying his step by a pamphlet in which he attacked the doctrines of the Christian Church. Siegebert, a renowned Benedictine monk at Metz, in the eleventh century, gave preference to the Jewish interpretations of the Bible on account of the superior learning of the Jews—a quality to which testimony was often borne in those days by church dignitaries of eminence. Clerics and monks learned Hebrew from their Jewish fellow-citizens.

When Adalbero, bishop of Metz (984–1005), died, he was sincerely mourned by Jews. Christians and Jews sang before each other the melodies of the church and the synagogue for the sake of mutually adapting them to their own divine service. Jews sometimes adopted Germanic names—even mythological ones, such as Fasolt, the name of a giant of the old pagan system of creed. There were intermarriages also between persons of the two

different creeds. Among the German peasantry and the common townsfolk a notion cropped up here and there that the Mosaic faith was the truer one. Throughout the German kingdom the commerce of the Jews was unrestricted then. They had freedom of settling in any part of the country. For their sake market-days were transposed from Saturdays to Sundays. In accordance with the practice of the time, Jews could buy slaves, nay, even receive them, by circumcision, into their own community—a habit which naturally led to some degree of intermixture of race. Though, from the point of view of the principles of humanity now prevalent, the custom of slave-buying has to be reprobated, the fact just mentioned, with the concomitant permission of a change of religion in the bondsman, shows that there was a remarkable latitude of action allowed to Jews, and no fanatic feeling at all against them.

Jews were then a most travelled race and preëminently in possession of the larger commerce. Their educational system and their literature were flourishing, judged from the standard of the period. At the same time, they felt themselves bound up with the life of the nation among which they lived to a far greater extent than was the case later on.

But the year 1096, as Dr. Güdemann says, is "entered in blood-red letters in the annals of the German Jews, especially of those of the Rhinelands." This was the year of the first Crusade. The grewsome persecutions which now began altered the Jewish character. It became timid, pedantically devotionalist, disheartened, superstitious, and pettily secretive—a change which, according to the author, left its traces for centuries. Small traffic and usury became now the means of sustenance for the hunted people, who often had to ransom themselves from the rapacity of the governing classes. Yet amid all this misery a nobler trait now and then flashes up ; especially when the creed of the persecuted was touched by tyrannic, inquisitorial hands. Then, not seldom, a martyr's spirit manifested itself, all of a sudden, in the full proudness of its conscience.

There is a great deal of evidence among Christian writers and poets of the middle ages which shows that usury was by no means an exclusively Jewish offence. The rift created by persecution between Jews and Christians was, however, made still more evident by the inquisitorial campaigns of Pope Innocent III., and

by his decree that the people of Hebrew descent had to be distinguished from their fellow-citizens by peculiar garments. In this way a pariah caste was marked out for public contempt. Yet among the Jews in the German Rhinelands there were not wanting examples of martial bravery and of civic spirit. During a siege at Worms, in the thirteenth century, Jews fought even on the Sabbath, with the permission of their rabbis, among the defenders of the town. At Köln, in 1270, when the citizens rose against the oppressive rule of the archbishop, there was, according to a rhymed chronicle of Gottfried Hagen,

". . . der Jude, her Daniel,
Ein Kone burger und snel"—

that is, "the Jew, Herr Daniel, a citizen bold and daring." It is remarkable that the title of "her" (Herr), which was then as a rule reserved for men of noble origin, is given to him. The Bishop of Köln himself was so struck with the valiant bearing of Daniel the Jew that, when the latter had become his prisoner, he presented him to the victors as a model of bravery. In a campaign of Duke Adolf of Nassau in France, an almost incredibly large number of Jews—30,000—are mentioned as having formed part of the army. Though the statement is clearly an exaggeration, there can be no doubt of its having had a large basis of fact. It may be brought to recollection that in Spain, also, Jews performed good military service.

Among German minnesingers of the early part of the thirteenth century, there was a Jew, Süsskind, of Trimberg. He sang of the freedom of thought "which penetrates through stone and steel and iron ; which goes quicker over the fields than the glance of the eye ; which soars up into the air above all eagles." He, however, had already a sad experience. Repelled by the rising spirit of intolerance, he says in one of his poems : "I was on a fool's errand with my art ; I will no longer go to the castles of noblemen that spurn me. I will grow a long beard of gray hairs, and live henceforth in old Jews' fashion. My mantle shall be a long one ; and deep down under my hat I shall walk most humbly. Seldom shall I sing courtly song any more, since noble lords refuse me their liberality." The latter remark refers to the custom of wandering minstrels of those days earning their livelihood through free gifts presented to them by the high-born pro-

tectors of the poetic art. Walther von der Vogelweide and all the great mimic singers lived in the same way. It was the accepted rule of the time for the foremost members of the poetic guild.

There is another poem by Süsskind, reminding us strongly of Robert Burns's "A man's a man for a' that." In this he says that true nobility is not founded on birth or parchments, but on a person's noble sentiments, on his virtuous character. Where these are wanting, where vices prevail, the aristocrat's dress becomes a mere rag (*da mak daz adelkleit wol werden ze einem hadel*). But "him who cannot boast of a renowned family name, and yet steers clear of vice, and generously does his best, him I call noble, though he be not born in the ranks of the great." Principles and feelings like these show what might have become of the population of Jewish origin in those earlier days, had not the hand of the persecutor crushed these promising germs and committed atrocities at which Humanity veils her face in shame and sorrow.

Probably most persons ordinarily passing for learned might be questioned on Jewish literature, outside the Bible and its commentaries, without being able to give any author's name, except perhaps those of Maimonides and Spinoza—if the latter can be ranged at all within the circle of Jewish literature, properly speaking. Of the many men of Hebrew faith who, as disciples of the Arabs, devoted themselves to philosophy, poetry, astronomy, mathematics, medicine, and philology, few of the best-educated will be found to have heard so much as the names. Yet there is a perfect galaxy of distinguished Jewish men of that kind, even if we take only the period before the fourteenth century of our era.

As a contribution towards more universal knowledge Dr. Güdemann's work is a serviceable one. It is written with full learning, and at the same time in that laudable spirit of impartiality which extenuates nothing, nor aught sets down in malice. In the first part, the author describes the time from the foundation of Jewish science in northern France until the disputes which arose about the writings of Maimonides, who, like many of his faith in Spain, had taken his cue from the Arabs, then the exponents of Hellenic culture. A further chapter is devoted to the gradual decline of Jewish science in northern France through persecution and internal divisions until the expulsion of the Jews

from France. The Jews inhabiting what is now southern France originally were in close contact, intellectually speaking, with their brethren beyond the Pyrenees, who were under the influence of the Arabs. In dealing with this point, the author remarks that the Arabs "lay in the fetters of Greek philosophy"; and he thinks "this Arabic influence produced the opposed tendencies of rationalism on the one hand and of mysticism on the other—both equally pernicious to Judaism and to science." We can understand such a remark from the author's position and calling, without certainly approving of it. On our part, we would rather say that rationalism and mysticism are ingrained in the differences of the human constitution, and we would prefer the former, beyond question, to any hardened system of creed. Irrespective of this point, however, which only occupies a few lines in the work before us, everything is put before the reader in a very fair and praiseworthy manner.

There are noteworthy passages on the close contact between various "heretical" sects among the Christians and the Jewish communities in the Middle Ages. Often there were, before the hideous inquisitorial persecutions had been ordered from Rome, religious discussions between men of the two creeds. Not rarely did Jews come out triumphantly in those debates by showing up absurd superstitions and priestly impostures. Readiness of repartee and knowledge even of theology, of the Hebrew as well as of the Christian, were to be found more among Jews than among ignorant Catholic priests and monks. This was so well understood that warnings had often to be uttered from priestly quarters against allowing Goliath to enter into an intellectual fight with David. Goliath meant the Roman Church; David the clever Jewish disputant. It is on record that the deception practised by priests upon their flock by means of a so-called incombustible "holy coat" (similar to the "seamless Holy Coat of Triex" of our times) was once exposed by a Jew in the middle ages. He disproved its incombustibility by burning it. A great charge against the Albigenses, the *Pauvres de Lyon*, and other Christian sects, was that they held spiritual community with the Jews.

The loose life led by the Catholic priesthood, which formed a strong contrast to that of rabbinical teachers, drew Christian heretics and Jews still closer to each other. The details of the

gross excesses and debauches of the clergy in France—the bishops foremost among them—are such that it is difficult to mention them here. Of course, the oppressed laymen had to pay heavily for these lawless clerical pleasures, and therefore naturally rebelled against their dissolute shepherds. The torture-chamber and the stake were the means of overthrowing such opposition; and as Albigense and other heresy was thus cruelly dealt with, the Jews were at the same time enveloped in the fierce and fiery persecution.

At a moment when "anti-Semite" fanaticism is, unfortunately, once more rife in more than one European country, it is well to cast our eyes upon these historical pictures. From them we see how much better human progress might have been achieved had not the earlier friendly intercourse between Christians and Jews been ruthlessly interrupted by an hierarchical system which aims at universal dominion, both spiritual and political, and whose relentless teaching and practice even tainted the minds of not a few men of the subsequent Reformation. At the end of this nineteenth century, the ninth century stands out, in some respects, as an age of comparative enlightenment in the treatment of fellow-citizens of non-Christian creed. All the greater is the shame, and all the greater the necessity for combating tendencies of bigotry and obscurantism which are a disgrace to our age.

KARL BLIND.

THE BEST FIELDS FOR PHILANTHROPY.

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE.

THE reception given to the first paper upon this subject, to which our lamented friend, the late editor and proprietor of this REVIEW, was pleased to give the first place in the June number, has been most encouraging to its author, as it would surely have been to the editor had he been spared, for he was most deeply interested in the subject. As showing the unflagging attention which Mr. Rice bestowed upon his editorial duties, it may be permissible to tell that the manuscript reached him in the morning, and late in the evening of the same day he called to say that it pleased him so much that he had determined to publish it in the forthcoming number, instead of holding it for the succeeding issue, as had been intended. When urged to delay publication, that proper time might be given for revision, he declined. Had he complied, another than he, alas! would have had to stand sponsor for my thoughts. Only one short week, and our friend was at rest; his warfare o'er. He had played his part in life well; and yet how little is he, or is any one, missed upon the march! The race presses slowly on as before; another rises to take the vacant place; THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW shines on, a lamp still burning, to show the great army of humanity the pitfalls which it must avoid in order to retain what has been already conquered, and to light the paths which that army must tread on its way to future conquests. In the death of Mr. Rice we have another proof that in the progress of humanity persons are little or nothing; the race is all.

"The individual withers, and the world is more and more."

And yet it is much to me that probably the last manuscript our friend read, valued, and published was "Wealth." Perhaps

your readers will pardon me for recalling an incident connected with our last interview. Sitting in my library, Mr. Rice expressed a wish to hear the author read his manuscript. I read and he listened from beginning to end, making but one interruption. When the passage was read which stated that, of every thousand dollars spent to-day in so-called charity, probably nine hundred was unwisely spent, he exclaimed, "Yes, nine hundred and fifty! Make it nine hundred and fifty!" and it was so made. I cannot pass without paying a tribute to Allen Thorndike Rice. That I knew him is one of the sources from which sweet remembrances spring at times, when free from the roar and bustle of life.

While "Wealth" has thus met a cordial reception upon this side of the Atlantic, it is natural that in the mother-land it should have attracted most attention, because the older civilization is at present brought more clearly face to face with socialistic questions. The contrast between the classes and the masses, between rich and poor, is not yet quite so sharp in this vast, fertile, and developing continent, with less than twenty persons per square mile, as in crowded little Britain, with fifteen times that number and no territory unoccupied. Perhaps the *Pall Mall Gazette* in its issue of September 5 puts most pithily the objections that have been raised to what the English have been pleased to call the "Gospel of Wealth." It says:

> "Great fortunes, says Mr. Carnegie, are great blessings to a community, because such and such things may be done with them. Well, but they are also a great curse, for such and such things are done with them. Mr. Carnegie's preaching, in other words, is altogether vitiated by Mr. Benzon's practice. The 'Gospel of Wealth' is killed by the acts."

To this the reply seems obvious: the gospel of Christianity is also killed by the acts. The same objection that is urged against the gospel of wealth lies against the commandment "Thou shalt not steal." It is no argument against a gospel that it is not lived up to; indeed, it is an argument in its favor, for a gospel must be higher than the prevailing standard. It is no argument against a law that it is broken: in that disobedience lies the reason for making and maintaining the law; the law which is never to be broken is never required.

Undoubtedly the most notable incident in regard to the "Gospel of Wealth" is that it was fortunate enough to attract the

attention of Mr. Gladstone, and brought forth the following note from him :

"I have asked Mr. Lloyd Bryce (*North American Review*) kindly to allow the republication in this country of the extremely interesting article on 'Wealth,' by Mr. Andrew Carnegie, which has just appeared in America."

This resulted in the publication of the article in several newspapers and periodicals, and an enterprising publisher issued it in pamphlet form. It is now sold in Britain for a penny.

All this is most encouraging, proving, as it does, that society is alive to the great issue involved, and is in a receptive mood. Your request, Mr. Editor, that I should continue the subject and point out the best fields for the use of surplus wealth may be taken as further proof that whether the ideas promulgated are to be received or rejected, they are at least certain to obtain a hearing.

Before entering upon the question which you have proposed, it may be advantageous to restate the positions taken in the former paper, for the benefit of those who may not have read it, or who cannot conveniently refer to it. It was assumed that the present laws of competition, accumulation, and distribution are the best obtainable conditions ; that through these the race receives its most valuable fruits ; and, therefore, that they should be accepted and upheld. Under these it was held that great wealth must inevitably flow into the hands of the few exceptional managers of men. The question then arose, What should these do with their surplus wealth ? and the "Gospel of Wealth" contended that surplus wealth should be considered as a sacred trust, to be administered during the lives of its owners, by them as trustees, for the best good of the community in which and from which it had been acquired.

It was pointed out that there were but three modes of disposing of surplus wealth, and two of these were held to be improper. First, it was held that to leave great fortunes to children did not prove true affection for them or interest in their genuine good, regarded either as individuals or as members of the state; that it was not the welfare of the children, but the pride of the parents, which inspired enormous legacies, and that, looking to the usual results of vast sums conferred upon children, the thoughtful man must be forced to say, if the good of the child

only were considered: "I would as soon leave to my son a curse as to leave to him the almighty dollar."

The second mode open to men is to hoard their surplus wealth during life, and leave it at death for public uses. It was pointed out that in many cases these bequests become merely monuments of the testators' folly; that the amount of real good done by posthumous gifts was ridiculously disproportionate to the sums thus left. The recent decision upon Mr. Tilden's will, which is said to have been drawn by the ablest of lawyers, and the partial failure of Mr. Williamson's purposes in regard to the great technical school which that millionaire intended to establish in Philadelphia, are lessons indeed for the rich who only bequeath.

The aim of the first article was thus to lead up to the conclusion that there is but one right mode of using enormous fortunes —namely, that the possessors from time to time during their own lives should so administer them as to promote the permanent good of the communities from which they have been gathered. It was held that public sentiment would soon say of one who died possessed of millions of available wealth which he might have administered: "The man who dies thus rich dies disgraced."

The purpose of this article is to present some of the best methods of performing this duty of administering surplus wealth for the good of the people. The first requisite for a really good use of wealth by the millionaire who has accepted the gospel which proclaims him only a trustee of the surplus that comes to him, is to take care that the purpose for which he spends it shall not have a degrading, pauperizing tendency upon its recipients, and that his trust should be so administered as to stimulate the best and most aspiring poor of the community to further efforts for their own improvement. It is not the irreclaimably destitute, shiftless, and worthless that it is truly beneficial or truly benevolent to attempt to reach and improve. For these there exists the refuge provided by the city or the state, where they can be sheltered, fed, clothed, and kept in comfortable existence, and—most important of all—where they can be isolated from the well-doing and industrious poor, who are liable to be demoralized by contact with these unfortunates. One man or woman who succeeds in living comfortably by begging is more dangerous to society, and a greater obstacle to the progress of humanity, than a score of wordy Socialists. The individual administrator of sur-

plus wealth has as his charge the industrious and ambitious; not those who need everything done for them, but those who, being most anxious and able to help themselves, deserve and will be benefited by help from others and the extension of their opportunities at the hands of the philanthropic rich.

It is ever to be remembered that one of the chief obstacles which the philanthropist meets in his efforts to do real and permanent good in this world is the practice of indiscriminate giving; and the duty of the millionaire is to resolve to cease giving to objects that are not proved clearly to his satisfaction to be deserving. He must remember Mr. Rice's belief, that nine hundred and fifty out of every thousand dollars bestowed to-day upon so-called charity had better be thrown into the sea. As far as my experience of the wealthy extends, it is unnecessary to urge them to give of their superabundance in charity so-called. Greater good for the race is to be achieved by inducing them to cease impulsive and injurious giving. As a rule, the sins of millionaires in this respect are not those of omission, but of commission, because they will not take time to think, and chiefly because it is much easier to give than to refuse. Those who have surplus wealth give millions every year which produce more evil than good, and which really retard the progress of the people, because most of the forms in vogue to-day for benefiting mankind only tend to spread among the poor a spirit of dependence upon alms, when what is essential for progress is that they should be inspired to depend upon their own exertions. The miser millionaire who hoards his wealth does less injury to society than the careless millionaire who squanders his unwisely, even if he does so under cover of the mantle of sacred charity. The man who gives to the individual beggar commits a grave offence, but there are many societies and institutions soliciting alms which it is none the less injurious to the community to aid. These are as corrupting as individual beggars. Plutarch's "Morals" contains this lesson: "A beggar asking an alms of a Lacedæmonian, he said: 'Well, should I give thee anything, thou wilt be the greater beggar, for he that first gave thee money made thee idle, and is the cause of this base and dishonorable way of living.'" As I know them, there are few millionaires, very few indeed, who are clear of this sin of having made beggars.

Bearing in mind these considerations, let us endeavor to pre-

sent some of the best uses to which a millionaire can devote the surplus of which he should regard himself as only the trustee.

First—Standing apart by itself there is the founding of a university by men enormously rich, such men as must necessarily be few in any country. Perhaps the greatest sum ever given by an individual for any purpose is the gift of Senator Stanford, who undertakes to establish upon the Pacific coast, where he amassed his enormous fortune, a complete university, which is said to involve the expenditure of ten millions of dollars, and upon which he may be expected to bestow twenty millions of his surplus. He is to be envied. A thousand years hence some orator, speaking his praise upon the then crowded shores of the Pacific, may repeat Griffith's eulogy of Wolsey, "In bestowing he was most princely: ever witness for him this great seat of learning." Here is a noble use of wealth.

We have many such institutions, Hopkins, Cornell, Packer, and others, but most of these have only been bequeathed, and it is impossible to extol any man greatly for simply leaving what he cannot take with him. Cooper, and Pratt, and Stanford, and others of this class deserve credit and the admiration of their fellows as much for the time and the attention given during their lives, as for their expenditure, upon their respective monuments.

We cannot have the Pacific coast in mind without recalling another important work of a different character which has recently been established there, the Lick Observatory. If any millionaire be interested in the ennobling study of astronomy,—and there should be and would be such if they but gave the subject the slightest attention,—here is an example which could well be followed, for the progress made in astronomical instruments and appliances is so great and continuous that every few years a new telescope might be judiciously given to one of the observatories upon this continent, the last being always the largest and the best, and certain to carry further and further the knowledge of the universe and of our relation to it here upon the earth. As one among many of the good deeds of the late Mr. Thaw, of Pittsburg, his constant support of the observatory there may be mentioned. This observatory enabled Professor Langley to make his wonderful discoveries. The professor is now at the head of the Smithsonian Institution, a worthy successor to Professor

Henry. Connected with him was Mr. Braeshier, of Pittsburg, whose instruments are in most of the principal observatories of the world. He was a common millwright, but Mr. Thaw recognized his genius and was his main support through trying days. This common workman has been made a professor by one of the foremost scientific bodies of the world. In applying part of his surplus in aiding these two now famous men, the millionaire Thaw did a noble work. Their joint labors have brought great, and are destined to bring still greater, credit upon their country in every scientific centre throughout the world.

It is reserved for very few to found universities, and, indeed, the use for many, or perhaps any, new universities does not exist. More good is henceforth to be accomplished by adding to and extending those in existence. But in this department a wide field remains for the millionaire as distinguished from the Crœsus among millionaires. The gifts to Yale University have been many, but there is plenty of room for others. The School of Fine Arts, founded by Mr. Street, the Sheffield Scientific School, endowed by Mr. Sheffield, and Professor Loomis's fund for the observatory, are fine examples. Mrs. C. J. Osborne's building for reading and recitation is to be regarded with especial pleasure as being the wise gift of a woman. Harvard University has not been forgotten; the Peabody Museum, and the halls of Wells, Matthews, and Thayer may be cited. Seber Hall is worthy of special mention, as showing what a genius like Richardson could do with the small sum of a hundred thousand dollars. The Vanderbilt University at Nashville, Tennessee, may be mentioned as a true product of the gospel of wealth. It was established by members of the Vanderbilt family during their lives—mark this vital feature—during their lives; for nothing counts for much that is left by a man at his death. Such funds are torn from him, not given by him. If any millionaire is at a loss to know how to accomplish great and indisputable good with his surplus, here is a field which can never be fully occupied, for the wants of our universities increase with the development of the country.

Second—The result of my own study of the question, What is the best gift which can be given to a community? is that a free library occupies the first place, provided the community will accept and maintain it as a public institution, as much a part of

the city property as its public schools, and, indeed, an adjunct to these. It is, no doubt, possible that my own personal experience may have led me to value a free library beyond all other forms of beneficence. When I was a boy in Pittsburg, Colonel Anderson, of Allegheny,—a name I can never speak without feelings of devotional gratitude,—opened his little library of four hundred books to boys. Every Saturday afternoon he was in attendance himself at his house to exchange books. No one but he who has felt it can know the intense longing with which the arrival of Saturday was awaited, that a new book might be had. My brother and Mr. Phipps, who have been my principal business partners through life, shared with me Colonel Anderson's precious generosity, and it was when revelling in these treasures that I resolved, if ever wealth came to me, that it should be used to establish free libraries, that other poor boys might receive opportunities similar to those for which we were indebted to that noble man.

Great Britain has been foremost in appreciating the value of free libraries for its people. Parliament passed an act permitting towns and cities to establish and maintain these as municipal institutions, and whenever the people of any town or city voted to accept the provisions of the act, the authorities were authorized to tax the community to the extent of one penny in the pound valuation. Most of the towns already have free libraries under this act. Many of these are the gifts of rich men, whose funds have been used for the building, and in some cases for the books also, the communities being required to maintain and to develop the libraries ; and to this feature I attribute most of their usefulness. An endowed institution is liable to become the prey of a clique. The public ceases to take interest in it, or, rather, never acquires interest in it. The rule has been violated which requires the recipients to help themselves. Everything has been done for the community instead of its being only helped to help itself.

Many free libraries have been established in our country, but none that I know of with such wisdom as the Pratt Library, of Baltimore. Mr. Pratt presented to the city of Baltimore one million dollars, requiring it to pay 5 per cent. per annum, amounting to fifty thousand dollars per year, which is to be devoted to the maintenance and development of the library and its branches. During last year 430,217 books were distributed ;

37,196 people of Baltimore are registered upon the books as readers; and it is safe to say that the 37,000 frequenters of the Pratt Library are of more value to Baltimore, to the State, and to the country than all the inert, lazy, and hopelessly-poor in the whole nation. And it may further be safely said that, by placing within the reach of 37,000 aspiring people books which they were anxious to obtain, Mr. Pratt has done more for the genuine progress of the people than has been done by all the contributions of all the millionaires and rich people to help those who cannot help themselves. The one wise administrator of his surplus has poured his fertilizing stream upon soil that was ready to receive it and return a hundred-fold. The many squanderers have not only poured their streams into sieves which never can be filled,—they have done worse; they have poured them into stagnant sewers that breed the diseases which afflict the body politic. And this is not all. The million dollars of which Mr. Pratt has made so grand a use are something, but there is something greater still. When the fifth branch library was opened in Baltimore, the speaker said:

"Whatever may have been done in these four years, it was his pleasure to acknowledge that much, very much, was due to the earnest interest, the wise councils, and the practical suggestions of Mr. Pratt. He never seemed to feel that the mere donation of great wealth for the benefit of his fellow-citizens was all that would be asked of him, but he wisely labored to make its application as comprehensive and effective as possible. Thus he constantly lightened burdens that were, at times, very heavy, brought good cheer and bright sunshine when clouds flitted across the sky, and made every officer and employee feel that good work was appreciated, and loyal devotion to duty would receive hearty commendation."

This is the finest picture I have ever seen of any of the millionaire class. As here depicted, Mr. Pratt is the ideal disciple of the "Gospel of Wealth." We need have no fear that the mass of toilers will fail to recognize in such as he their best leaders and their most invaluable allies; for the problem of poverty and wealth, of employer and employed, will be practically solved whenever the time of the few is given, and their wealth is administered during their lives, for the best good of that portion of the community which has not been burdened by the responsibilities which attend the possession of wealth. We shall have no antagonism between classes when that day comes, for the high and the low, the rich and the poor, shall then indeed be brothers.

No millionaire will go far wrong in his search for one of the best forms for the use of his surplus who chooses to establish a free library in any community that is willing to maintain and develop it.

John Bright's words should ring in his ear: "It is impossible for any man to bestow a greater benefit upon a young man than to give him access to books in a free library." Closely allied to the library, and, where possible, attached to it, there should be rooms for an art gallery and museum, and a hall for such lectures and instruction as are provided in the Cooper Union. The traveller upon the Continent is surprised to find that every town of importance has its art gallery and museum; these may be large or small, but in any case each has a receptacle for the treasures of the locality, which is constantly receiving valuable gifts and bequests. The free library and art gallery of Birmingham are remarkable among these, and every now and then a rich man adds to their value by presenting books, fine pictures, or other works of art. All that our cities require to begin with is a proper fire-proof building. Their citizens who travel will send to it rare and costly things from every quarter of the globe they visit, while those who remain at home will give or bequeath to it of their treasures. In this way these collections will grow until our cities will ultimately be able to boast of permanent exhibitions from which their own citizens will derive incalculable benefit, and which they will be proud to show to visitors. In the Metropolitan Museum of Art in this city we have made an excellent beginning. Here is another avenue for the proper use of surplus wealth.

Third—We have another most important department in which great sums can be worthily used,—the founding or extension of hospitals, medical colleges, laboratories, and other institutions connected with the alleviation of human suffering, and especially with the prevention rather than the cure of human ills. There is no danger of pauperizing a community in giving for such purposes, because such institutions relieve temporary ailments or shelter only those who are hopeless invalids. What better gift than a hospital can be given to a community that is without one?—the gift being conditioned upon its proper maintenance by the community in its corporate capacity. If hospital accommodation already exists, no better method for using surplus wealth can be found than in making additions to it. The late Mr. Vanderbilt's gift of half a million of dollars to the medical department of Columbia College for a chemical laboratory was one of the wisest possible uses of wealth. It strikes at the prevention of disease by penetrating into its causes. Several others

have established such laboratories, but the need for them is still great.

If there be a millionaire in the land who is at a loss what to do with the surplus that has been committed to him as trustee, let him investigate the good that is flowing from these chemical laboratories. No medical college is complete without its laboratory. As with universities, so with medical colleges; it is not new institutions that are required, but additional means for the more thorough equipment of those that exist. The forms that benefactions to these may wisely take are numerous, but probably none is more useful than that adopted by Mr. Osborne when he built a school for training female nurses at Bellevue College. If from all gifts there flows one-half of the good that comes from this wise use of a millionaire's surplus, the most exacting may well be satisfied. Only those who have passed through a lingering and dangerous illness can rate at their true value the care, skill, and attendance of trained female nurses. Their employment as nurses has enlarged the sphere and influence of woman. It is not to be wondered at that a Senator of the United States and a physician distinguished in this country for having received the highest distinctions abroad should find their wives from this class.

Fourth—In the very front rank of benefactions public parks should be placed, always provided that the community undertakes to maintain, beautify, and preserve inviolate the parks given to it. No more useful or more beautiful monument can be left by any man than a park for the city in which he was born or in which he has long lived, nor can the community pay a more graceful tribute to the citizen who presents it than to give his name to the gift. If a park be already provided, there is still room for many judicious gifts in connection with it. Mr. Phipps, of Allegheny, has given conservatories to the park there, which are visited by many every day of the week and crowded by thousands of working people every Sunday, for, with rare wisdom, he has stipulated as a condition of the gift that the conservatories shall be open on Sundays. The result of his experiment has been so gratifying that he is justified in adding to them from his surplus, as he is doing largely this year. To any lover of flowers among the wealthy I commend a study of what is possible for them to do in the line of Mr. Phipps's example; and may they please note that Mr. Phipps is a wise as well as a liberal giver, for

he requires the city to maintain these conservatories, and thus secures for them forever the public ownership, the public interest, and the public criticism of their management. Had he undertaken to manage and maintain them, it is probable that popular interest in the gift would never have been awakened.

The parks and pleasure-grounds of small towns throughout Europe are not less surprising than their libraries, museums, and art galleries. We saw nothing more pleasing during our recent travels than the hillside of Bergen, in Norway. It has been converted into one of the most picturesque of pleasure-grounds; fountains, cascades, water-falls, delightful arbors, fine terraces, and statues adorn what was before a barren mountain side. Here is a field worthy of study by the millionaire who would confer a lasting benefit upon his fellows. Another beautiful instance of the right use of wealth in the direction of making cities more and more attractive we found in Dresden. The owner of the leading paper there bequeathed its revenues forever to the city, to be used in beautifying it. An art committee decides from time to time what new artistic feature is to be introduced or what hideous feature is to be changed, and as the revenues accrue they are expended in this direction. Thus through the gift of this patriotic newspaper proprietor his native city of Dresden is fast becoming one of the most artistic places of residence in the whole world. A work having been completed, it devolves upon the city to maintain it forever. May I be excused if I commend to our millionaire newspaper proprietors the example of their colleague in the capital of Saxony?

Scarcely a city of any magnitude in the older countries is without many structures and features of great beauty. Much has been spent upon ornament, decoration, and architectural effect: we are still far behind in these things upon this side of the Atlantic. Our Republic is great in some things,—in material development unrivalled; but let us always remember that in art and in the finer touches we have scarcely yet taken a place. Had the exquisite memorial arch recently erected temporarily in New York been shown in Dresden, the art committee there would probably have been enabled, from the revenue of the newspaper given by its owner for just such purposes, to order its permanent erection to adorn the city forever.

While the bestowal of a park upon a community as one

of the best uses for surplus wealth will be universally approved, in embracing such additions to it as conservatories, or in advocating the building of memorial arches and works of adornment, it is probable that many will think we go too far, and consider these somewhat fanciful. The material good to flow from them may not be so directly visible; but let not any practical mind, intent only upon material good, depreciate the value of wealth given for these or for kindred æsthetic purposes as being useless as far as the mass of the people and their needs are concerned. As with libraries and museums, so with these more distinctively artistic works; these perform their great use when they reach the best of the masses of the people. It is worth more to reach and touch the sentiment for beauty in the naturally bright minds of this class than that those incapable of being so touched should be pandered to. For what the improver of the race must endeavor to do is to reach those who have the divine spark ever so feebly developed, that it may be strengthened and grow. For my part, I think Mr. Phipps put his money to better use in giving the workingmen of Allegheny conservatories filled with beautiful flowers, orchids, and aquatic plants, which they, with their wives and children, can enjoy in their spare hours, and on which they can feed the love for the beautiful, than if he had given his surplus money to furnish them with bread, for those in health who cannot earn their bread are scarcely worth considering by the individual giver; the care of such being the duty of the state. The man who erects in a city a truly artistic arch, statue, or fountain makes a wise use of his surplus. "Man does not live by bread alone."

Fifth—We have another good use for surplus wealth, in providing for our cities halls suitable for meetings of all kinds, especially for concerts of elevating music. Our cities are rarely provided with halls for these purposes, being in this respect also very far behind European cities. The Springer Hall, of Cincinnati, that valuable addition to the city, was largely the gift of Mr. Springer, who was not content to bequeath funds from his estate at death, but who gave during his life, and, in addition, gave—what was equally important—his time and business ability to insure the successful results which have been achieved. The gift of a hall to any city lacking one is an excellent use for surplus wealth for the good of a community. The reason

why the people have only one instructive and elevating, or even amusing, entertainment when a dozen would be highly beneficial, is that the rent of a hall, even when a suitable hall exists (which is rare), is so great as to prevent managers from running the risk of financial failure. If every city in our land owned a hall which could be given or rented for a small sum for such gatherings as a committee or the mayor of the city judged advantageous, the people could be furnished with proper lectures, amusements, and concerts at an exceedingly small cost. The town halls of European cities, many of which have organs, are of inestimable value to the people, when utilized as they are in the manner suggested. Let no one underrate the influence of entertainments of an elevating or even of an amusing character, for these do much to make the lives of the people happier and their natures better. If any millionaire born in a small village, which has now become a great city, is prompted in the day of his success to do something for his birthplace with part of his surplus, his grateful remembrance cannot take a form more useful than that of a public hall with an organ, provided the city agrees to maintain and use it.

Sixth—In another respect we are still much behind Europe. A form of beneficence which is not uncommon there is providing swimming baths for the people. The donors of these have been wise enough to require the city benefited to maintain them at its own expense, and as proof of the contention that everything should never be done for any one or for any community, but that the recipients should invariably be called upon to do part, it is significant that it is found essential for the popular success of these healthful establishments to exact a nominal charge for their use. In many cities, however, the school children are admitted free at fixed hours upon certain days, different hours being fixed for the boys and the girls to use the great swimming baths, hours or days being also fixed for the use of these baths by ladies. In inland cities the young of both sexes are thus taught to swim. Swimming clubs are organized, and matches are frequent, at which medals and prizes are given. The reports published by the various swimming baths throughout Great Britain are filled with instances of lives saved because those who fortunately escaped shipwreck had been taught to swim in the baths, and not a few instances are given in which the pupils of certain

bathing establishments have saved the lives of others. If any disciple of the "Gospel of Wealth" gives his favorite city large swimming and private baths (provided the municipality undertakes their management as a city affair), he will never be called to account for an improper use of the funds intrusted to him.

Seventh—Churches as fields for the use of surplus wealth have purposely been reserved until the last, because, these being sectarian, every man will be governed by his own attachments; therefore gifts to churches, it may be said, are not, in one sense, gifts to the community at large, but to special classes. Nevertheless, every millionaire may know of a district where the little cheap, uncomfortable, and altogether unworthy wooden structure stands at the crossroads, to which the whole neighborhood gathers on Sunday, and which is the centre of social life and source of neighborly feeling. The administrator of wealth has made a good use of part of his surplus if he replaces that building with a permanent structure of brick, stone, or granite, up the sides of which the honeysuckle and columbine may climb, and from whose tower the sweet-tolling bell may sound. The millionaire should not figure how cheaply this structure can be built, but how perfect it can be made. If he has the money, it should be made a gem, for the educating influence of a pure and noble specimen of architecture, built, as the pyramids were built, to stand for ages, is not to be measured by dollars. Every farmer's home, heart, and mind in the district will be influenced by the beauty and grandeur of the church. But having given the building, the donor should stop there; the support of the church should be upon its own people; there is not much genuine religion in the congregation or much good to flow from the church which is not supported at home.

Many other avenues for the wise expenditure of surplus wealth might be indicated. I enumerate but a few—a very few—of the many fields which are open, and only those in which great or considerable sums can be judiciously used. It is not the privilege, however, of millionaires alone to work for or aid measures which are certain to benefit the community. Every one who has but a small surplus above his moderate wants may share this privilege with his richer brothers, and those without surplus can give at least part of their time, which is usually as important as funds, and often more so. Some day, perhaps, with

your permission, I will endeavor to point out some fields and modes in which these may perform well their part as trustees of wealth or leisure, according to the measure of their respective fortunes.

It is not expected, neither is it desirable, that there should be a general concurrence as to the best possible use of surplus wealth. For different men and different localities there are different uses. What commends itself most highly to the judgment of the administrator is the best use for him, for his heart should be in the work. It is as important in administering wealth as it is in any other branch of a man's work that he should be enthusiastically devoted to it and feel that in the field selected his work lies.

Besides this, there is room and need for all kinds of wise benefactions for the common weal. The man who builds a university, library, or laboratory performs no more useful work than he who elects to devote himself and his surplus means to the adornment of a park, the gathering together of a collection of pictures for the public, or the building of a memorial arch. These are all true laborers in the vineyard. The only point required by the "Gospel of Wealth" is that the surplus which accrues from time to time in the hands of a man should be administered by him in his own lifetime for that purpose which is seen by him, as trustee, to be best for the good of the people. To leave at death what he cannot take away, and place upon others the burden of the work which it was his own duty to perform, is to do nothing worthy. This requires no sacrifice, nor any sense of duty to his fellows.

Time was when the words concerning the rich man entering heaven were regarded as a hard saying. To-day, when all questions are probed to the bottom and the standards of faith receive the most liberal interpretations, the startling verse has been relegated to the rear, to await the next kindly revision as one of those things which cannot be quite understood, but which meanwhile—it is carefully to be observed—are not to be understood literally. But is it so very improbable that the next stage of thought is not to restore the doctrine in all its pristine purity and force, as being in perfect harmony with sound ideas upon the subject of wealth and poverty, the rich and the poor, and the contrasts everywhere seen and deplored? In Christ's day, it is evident, reformers were against the wealthy. It is none the less

evident that we are fast recurring to that position to-day; and there will be nothing to surprise the student of sociological development if society should soon approve the text which has caused so much anxiety: "It is easier for a camel to enter the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven." Even if the needle were the small casement at the gates, the words betoken serious difficulty for the rich. It will be but a step for the theologian to take from the doctrine that he who dies rich dies disgraced to that which brings upon the man punishment or deprivation hereafter.

The "Gospel of Wealth" but echoes Christ's words. It calls upon the millionaire to sell all that he hath and give it in the highest and best form to the poor, by administering his estate himself for the good of his fellows, before he is called upon to lie down and rest upon the bosom of Mother Earth. So doing, he will approach his end no longer the ignoble hoarder of useless millions, poor, very poor indeed, in money, but rich, very rich, twenty times a millionaire still, in the affection, gratitude, and admiration of his fellow-men, and—sweeter far—soothed and sustained by the still small voice within, which, whispering, tells him that, because he has lived, perhaps one small part of the great world has been bettered just a little. This much is sure: against such riches as these no bar will be found at the Gates of Paradise.

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

GERMAN OPERA AND EVERY-DAY LIFE.

BY WALTER DAMROSCH.

FIVE years ago the German opera was founded by Dr. Leopold Damrosch at the Metropolitan Opera-House, in New York, and these five years have witnessed one of the most remarkable phenomena in the art-history of America. A people descended from all the nationalities of the globe, with no mythological past of their own, have received with enthusiasm and growing appreciation a series of musical dramas by Richard Wagner, based on the old German mythology, played in a world absolutely foreign to their own, and governed by certain art-laws which revolutionized all preconceived ideas on this subject. It seems remarkable that it should be possible for a people occupied almost exclusively with material things to understand a world so unreal and ideal as this; to appreciate a work based on the mythology of a past age,—as if they, too, had heard the tales of the Edda in childhood, and had grown up among the remains of a past which stretches into the dim prehistoric ages.

It is interesting to look for the causes that led to this artistic awakening of our people. These are not far to seek.

Wagner, perhaps the greatest universal genius since Shakespeare, has given his works a translation which should make them intelligible to all. (There is one universal language, and that is music, for as an art it has no nationality.) Its germs, the folk-song and dance, are national, but its developments take it out of the narrow limitations of race or geography, and in its highest forms, its purest manifestations, it speaks and belongs to all the world.

Realizing this great power, and developing its possibilities in this direction to a hitherto unheard-of extent, Wagner translated every character on the stage, every emotion, the dramatic ac-

tion, even the great symbolic ideas underlying his poems, by a music composed of a series of most characteristic phrases or motives. This system was but the natural result of his constant striving for dramatic truth, and his works show the gradual evolution of this idea. Already in the "Flying Dutchman" do we find a musical motive expressive of the central character of the opera, but the full development of the system was reached in the "Nibelungen Trilogy," where motive is joined to motive, developed with marvellous artistic skill, forming a musical current rolling along in the orchestra, and accompanying and amplifying every word as the drama progresses.

Americans were quick to appreciate all this. Here was something tangible, something that appealed to the intellect as well as to the imagination, and even before the names and significance of these motives were fully understood, the mind half-unconsciously associated certain actions on the stage with certain harmonies or melodies which accompanied them. Through the musical interpretation, the various vague and mystic characters of the old Sagas are made to stand clearly before us. Their characterization is complete and intelligible to all, and more clearly than ever before do we feel the great power of music to disclose to us subtle and delicate shades of meaning, which words alone could never hope to express.

Such a union of words and music, such a completion of one by the other, could only have been acomplished where both poet and musician were combined in one, as in Wagner, for even as he wrote the words of his dramas, their musical significance and expression were almost simultaneously created, and the writing of them down became simply a mechanical act.

Wagner loved to choose the subjects for his dramas from the old mythologies and legends of the people, because in these their strivings and ideals found form with greater clearness and naïve simplicity than in any actual historical event. The emotions and passions displayed in the earliest myths are common to all the world, but as the centuries rolled by their characters became encrusted with local additions, and, from general human types, were narrowed down to national characters. In many instances different versions, as developed by different nations, existed, and it was only by divesting them of these local additions and mere externals that Wagner brought out and gave to us the original elements, the mother-types which con-

tain the germs of all human emotions within them. And these must appeal to us all, for no matter how far from the mother-race we may have wandered, there is something in these grand old heroic types of men and women which speaks to us as some half-forgotten song of our childhood, as something that we, too, once possessed and called ours. They are far removed from the conventionalities of the "modern," and the symbolisms in which they are clothed are for all times and all men.

Wagner touches on this in his essay, "Eine Mittheilung an meine Freunde," as follows:

"Since my return from Paris to Germany I had made the German past ages my favorite study. I have mentioned before the deep longing for my country which filled me at that time. This country in its present reality could not requite my longings in any way, and I felt that a deeper yearning must be at the bottom of my desires, which found nourishment in another than the mere longing for my *modern* home. As if to sound its depths, I penetrated down to the original home element (*das urheimische Element*) that appears to us in the poetry of the past, which draws us nearer and closer, as the present with inimical coldness rejects us. All our wishes and burning desires, which in reality carry us into the *future*, we seek to realize from the pictures of the *past*, in order to create a form for them which the modern *present* cannot give.

"In the effort to give artistic form to the wishes of my heart, and in the desire to learn what it was that drew me so unresistingly to the fount of the old Sagas, I arrived step by step into the realm of the remote past, where, to my great joy, and even there, in the *remotest* past, I found at last the youthfully beautiful *man* in the pristine freshness of his strength.

"My studies thus carried me through the poems of the mediæval ages back to the beginning of the old German mythology; one garment after the other, that the later versions had thrown about him, I succeeded in taking off, to behold him at last in his purest beauty. What I here saw was no longer the historic, conventional figure, on which the garment must interest us more than the person; but the real naked *man*, on whom I could perceive every throbbing of the heart, every play of the strong muscles, in untrammelled freest motion; in short, the *true man*. . . . If the glorious figure of *Siegfried* had already attracted me for a long time, it really only began to enthuse me when I had succeeded in freeing it from later additions, and seeing it before me in its purest human form. Only now did I recognize the possibility of making him the hero of a drama, which never occurred to me, as long as I knew him solely from the mediæval *Nibelungen-lied*."

Although Americans, as a race, are young, the veneration for the immediate past, the childhood of its people, existed already in a marked degree. Old family histories, miniatures, and heirlooms are preserved with religious veneration, and many an American is proud to be able to trace the birth of his family to some little spot in old Europe, glad that he, too, is connected with the past, although his work is to conquer the new. But of the prehistoric past, the mythology of the people from whom he is descended, the American knew little or nothing. He was not in touch with it, and, at best, its characters were but so many

curious and perhaps interesting figures of a world with which he had nothing in common.

It would have been difficult, perhaps impossible, for him to assimilate the spirit of the Norse Sagas and legendary lore, but music, that great universalist, spoke, and translated them for him in a language which he, too, can understand; and thus the miracle has been accomplished, and *Siegfried* and *Brunhilde*, *Lohengrin* and *Tanhäuser*, belong to-day as much to the musical people of America as to Germany.

It is interesting to note that, of the many musical motives employed by Wagner in the "Nibelungen Trilogy," those descriptive or symbolic of the elements of nature found their way first to the understanding of our people. They appreciated at once the grand portrayal of water, the mighty element, in the introduction to "Rhinegold," the remarkable development of the Water Motive on one and the same chord surging on ward and upward in constant and increasing motion; also the motive of "*Loki*," the element of fire, the scheming, deceitful god. They were quick to perceive its symbolic character, its chromatic figures seeming to dart hither and thither in restless activity, like so many tongues of flickering flame, and then again the steady glow, so wonderfully expressed in the orchestra, as *Wotan* binds this restless element to burn in a circle of fire around the sleeping *Brunhilde*. At the first performance of this scene at the Metropolitan Opera-House the audience were aroused to a wild pitch of enthusiasm which has since been equalled only by other performances of the same master's works. A strange and interesting fact in this connection is the enthusiastic reception which the "Ride of the Valkyries" received in *concert* performances before it was ever given in connection with a dramatic performance. So great is the descriptive power of music in this that it pictured to our imagination, without the help of a scenic background or stage performance, the glorious *Valkyries* as they ride through the air, bearing the slain heroes to *Walhall*. The unbridled freedom and trembling excitement, the elemental force of the music, were appreciated by none sooner than by Americans. How our nerves tingle and our hearts beat, as the first rush of the Ride Motive comes to our ears, and what a stupendous climax is reached when the *Valkyries'* Battle Motive breaks forth in its rude strength and rhythmic daring. We hear

the whinnying of the horses, the battle-cry of the great war-maidens, and above all the thunderous hoofbeat of the gigantic wild chargers as they rush through the clouds. The picture thus conveyed to our mind is complete, and far more perfect than scenic art or stage machinery can as yet accomplish.

Americans are great lovers of nature, but perhaps never before had the poetry of the forest been brought so near to them as in the second act of "Siegfried," where the sacred quiet of the forest, the rustling of the leaves, the flickering sunlight as it filters through them, throwing its bright patches on the green moss, the chirping of the birds, the hum of insects, are all reproduced in a music which defies description, but which speaks with a directness and truth, a fidelity to the most delicate phases of poetry in nature, that must appeal to all. The whole scene forms a fitting background to the boy *Siegfried,* who, outstretched beneath the wide-branching linden-tree, gives vent to his longing for a being like himself; for this child of the forest has seen that all the beasts, the birds, and the fishes find mates, and only he is all alone, an ugly dwarf his sole companion.

These portrayals of nature, as well as the motives expressive of the fundamental passions or emotions, were the first to be felt by our audience; but gradually the more symbolic motives and their deeper meanings were appreciated as they became more and more familiar—the motive of the "Curse on the Ring," with its grating dissonances, the sharp-cutting, flashing Sword Motive, symbolic of the heroic race created by *Wotan,* and from these to the motives of *Siegfried,* the boy, with its merry hunting fanfare, and *Siegfried,* the man, with its more sustained, heroic character, down to *Siegfried's* death and the accompanying funeral music, which gives us in grand succession the whole tragic history of the *Volsungen race*—a veritable funeral oration in music.

At the first performance of the "Götterdämmerung" in New York, the opinion was quite generally expressed that Wagner had here reached his greatest musical and dramatic climax, and that the drama should have ended here; but gradually the still higher climax revealed by him in the end of the last act dawned upon the audience, as the significance of the "Atonement through Love" Motive, the most exalted of all, became apparent, for it is through *Brunhilde's* self-sacrifice that the curse is lifted from the ring and

the world ; and with this idea the trilogy ends, the deeply symbolic motive foreshadowing the Christian religion—the idea of self-sacrifice through love. Many among the audience realized perhaps for the first time the close connection which always must exist, directly or indirectly, between art and religion—that the two are inseparable, serving the same purpose and striving for the same ends.

The interest among musical people to learn more about these wonderful creations and their deeper symbolic significance became intense. The performances in New York and other cities were crowded from pit to dome, and the better acquainted the people became with the music, the greater became their enthusiasm. The frivolity which characterized the behavior of a portion of our people during the period when a "amusement operas" were principally performed at our opera-houses grew less and less with the founding of the German opera, and finally ceased altogether as the idea gained ground that music and the drama had also other purposes than the mere amusement of an idle hour, and that even on weekdays some time could be spent with nobler things in a building formerly considered to exist only as a gathering-place for the idle world.

All this means more than a mere craze or fashion ; it means an awakening of the masses to the ideal, to things beyond the material, which nothing else had been able to accomplish to such a degree before. Wagner has drawn the people into his magic circle, and even the unmusical are beginning to see the possibilities of music as a refining and chastening influence over our emotions. With its help he has given to Americans the past. It is theirs to hold and to keep, if they will but stretch out their hands for this rich treasure; for this is necessary to the development of an artistic spirit in our race. Art cannot live on the present, which is ever too much entangled with the material, and the conventionalities of life, but must draw its sustenance from the remote past, where our imagination, our poetic spirit, can be kindled, and we can behold the heroic type as developed in all its original strength in the mythology of the people. True art should spring from the people and speak to the people. It can never take a firm foothold as long as it remains a luxury instead of becoming a necessity. Wagner has done much to show us the way from the material to the ideal, where our spirit can find refuge and sustenance. It

had almost become strangled under the universal greed for the material; the "*Curse of the Gold*" was upon it, and it needed such a popular uprising as was produced by the "Nibelungen Trilogy" to prove that it was not dead, and that a little care and nursing would bring it to healthful life and strength. Much has been done, but more remains. It was natural that American women should have preceded the sterner sex in the development of the artistic temperament. Their greater freedom from the material spirit of the country, and the exalted position accorded them by men,—far above that of the women of any other country,—gave them opportunities for the development of heart and mind of which they availed themselves to the fullest extent.

The time is not far distant when it was thought unadvisable to teach boys anything of music for fear that it might take their minds too much from business interests, and it is only lately that a healthy reaction has set in and they, too, are permitted to learn what will prove to them in after years the greatest rest and relaxation from the prose of every-day affairs. That this reaction is due to a great extent to the influence of American mothers there can be no doubt, and now that a more even artistic development is going on among both sexes greater results may be expected from the future. The children of to-day are the men and women of to-morrow. Let their imagination be kindled by the old fairy tales, and as they grow older let them read the stories of the heroes of the Greek and Norse mythologies, told in a simple way that they can understand. And, above all, let music, and only good music, be around and about them always. The days of the hard prose of life come soon enough; and they will be better able to meet and conquer these if they have the memory of a poetic childhood to strengthen and to sustain them. Let the church also examine with more interest the possibilities of art as a factor in religion, although not of sectarianism. While some ministers are enthusiastic devotees of music, a great majority have but vague ideas on the subject, many having labored under the great disadvantage of not having had proper opportunities for self-development. Good musicians are scarce in this country, if we take into consideration its enormous area and its 65,000,000 of people. Cities like New York and Boston are already well supplied, but fifty good leaders could be placed to advantage in fifty differ-

ent cities of the Union. The signs are auspicious. Never was there such an awakening to art; never such a grand field for musicians to work in. There is room for all who may come, and as the country is as yet too young to supply all its needs in this repect, let us welcome gladly all foreign musicians who come to these shores to assist in our country's development.

The next great musical genius of the world should be an American; but he can only come after generations of musicians have prepared our soil and sown the seed which, under the warmth of his sacred fire, shall ripen to a rich harvest.

WALTER DAMROSCH.

THE INCAPACITY OF BUSINESS WOMEN.

BY MARION HARLAND.

IN THIS article it will be taken for granted that men conduct all branches of what is known as business—manufacturing, mercantile, professional, and even educational—more systematically and successfully than women. Such shining exceptions as arise in the mind of every reader who is inclined to doubt the premises make the surrounding gloom more apparent.

She who refuses to recognize the truth is a short-sighted champion of her sex. She who, perceiving the justice of the censure, throws the blame of the present state of affairs upon tyrant man, and exhorts an oppressed class to rebellion that shall reverse the position of governed and governors, offers an intoxicating draught instead of a remedy.

During the war in the Sudan, a young British officer in charge of the signal service, posted for the time upon the top of the Great Pyramid, was so uplifted by historic associations and Napoleonic example as to telegraph to the admiral's ship, just arrived in the nearest offing: "*Forty centuries salute you!*" The martinet superior signalled back: "None of your [expletive] nonsense! Attend to business!"

This somewhat profane anecdote illustrates what I shall offer as the fundamental cause of the unfitness of the average woman for business pursuits. Not forty, but sixty, centuries of PRECEDENT handicap her who would earn her bread after the manner of men, without fear of social ostracism and without favor offered as a gallant gratuity. From the time of her foremother Eve until now, hers has been unsalaried labor. Two centuries of the same system of desultory tasks, done for board and clothing, sufficed to make thriftless pensioners of the colored race. He who has never known for himself the duties and responsibilities of ownership is, notoriously, a bad guardian of others' property.

The Indian dervish whose arm, upshot in prayer, is held thus,

week by week, until he cannot lower it, is not an inapt figure of the modern woman. She has had her "keep," and pocket-money for the asking—quantity and quality depending upon the manner of petition, her lord's humor, or her personal attractions—for unnumbered generations. To expect from her stiffened muscles such action as he displays whose moral and mental brawn has been developed by the steady exercise of centuries is cruelly preposterous.

Leaving general propositions for particular intances, we will take a department of honest toil where, it is affirmed, women compete most successfully with men—that of the sales-clerk, especially in dry-goods, fancy, and millinery shops. The sternest master virtually admits the comparative incompetency of his feminine employees in other ways, as well as in wages. The laxity of discipline among them is manifest to the least observant. The "sales-lady" who waits upon me may be supercilious to the verge of impertinence, slow, and inattentive; she may hum a tune while listlessly displaying the wares she is paid to exhibit to advantage, and carry on lively, if intermittent, gossip or altercation with her mates, while I am—in spite of her—conducting my purchases,—and all in sight and hearing of the floor-walker who would arraign a salesman for any one of these offences against common courtesy. The feminine peculiarities of levity, wandering eyes and thoughts, misnamed "vivacity," and the quality we term in colts and kittens "skittishness," are so well known to every overlooker of women clerks, operatives, and teachers as to purchase indulgence, unconsciously exercised and ungratefully received. Moreover, these idiosyncrasies, seldom catalogued as faults, *keep wages down.*

The office-boy is ruled up sharply by line and plummet, not only as to work, but deportment. He must be punctual, move quickly and quietly, leave all thought of frolic and out-door companionships behind when he crosses the threshold of his place of business; he must be prompt and respectful in speech to employers, and civil to customer, client, and caller—or he goes! The girl stenographer and typewriter "giggles and makes giggle" with the girl book-keeper, and has tiffs (audible) with her enemy, the "old-maid" cashier. One and all, when reproved for negligence, breach of rules, or inefficiency, they retort, or sulk, or—most likely—snivel! In no one respect is precedent more potent than in this matter of women's tears. The briny drip is the most powerful solvent known to science or sentimentalist. I have in

memory the true story of one "lady" manager of an important department, who kept her place long after her unfitness was acknowledged by the firm, because of a proclivity to hysterics. Every man in the establishment, married or celibate, shrank from the task of discharging her. The information that she must seek another position was finally conveyed in a letter, enclosing a *placebo* in the form of a check, written and sent to her by a partner on the eve of sailing for Europe.

Such straws show the trend of the popular estimate of women's unfitness for business pursuits. It is as natural for a man to avoid "scenes" as for women to get them up. Some of the latter trade, wittingly, upon feeling, calculating cunningly upon the proverbial effect of lachrymal demonstration. The majority do not. Precedent, which they mistake for Nature and one of Heaven's laws, decrees that they must be treated according to a certain set of rules—men according to another and a different.

Here lies the defective spot in the claim for equitable wages for working women. Physical disability apart, *they do not work as men do.* A man grasps his business with both hands. If his hands are not strong enough, he clamps it with his feet, and, rather than let it go, seizes it with his jaws. It is his life—himself! A woman, even when the daily bread of herself and her children depends upon a clerkship, or employment in a factory, or the teacher's place in a public school, regards her labor as the means to an end. It is the ladder reared against the height she would win. A man's chosen craft or profession is the central stone staircase, built into the solid structure. Men work by the job, concentrating every energy upon the task of perfecting that which must pass or be rejected upon its own merit. Women go out by the day—and watch the clock! Men have ambitions; women have hopes.

The reasons assigned for these radical differences are led off in most essays on the subject, and pertinently, by the fact that women look forward to marriage as a definite means of support, and hold but loosely that which they may be called upon at any moment to give up. With an immense proportion of the sex this explanation more than covers the ground. It does not account for the perfunctory manner in which the deserted wife or faithful widow walks through what she makes to be the tread-mill of daily toil. She considers the necessity of self-support as violence done to Nature and PRECEDENT. Always *that!* The contestants

for equal rights and equitable compensation must dethrone this idol before women can become self-supporting. The work which is not honored of the laborer will never honor her.

I had occasion once to call in the services of a trained nurse for a member of my family. While the child remained extremely ill, the attendant was all that could be desired for skill, fidelity, and modest dignity of deportment. The crisis passed and convalescence assured, precedent came to the front. The nurse discoursed to the patient by the hour upon the hard lot that had obliged her to earn her living; enumerated the handsome gowns, silver, and other valuables that had been hers in her former estate; unfolded to me her pedigree of gentlemen and gentlewomen for four generations, and dropped tears upon the bread she toasted while asserting to the kitchen-cabinet her right to be treated as a "real lady, although unfortunate."

Another sick-nurse, an otherwise sensible woman of forty-odd years, carried about with her always a roll of MS. penned by her late husband, a drunken penny-a-liner, whose one kindness to her was done in dying. "Ah! if he had lived to get his book printed, I'd never have been taking care of sick people for twenty dollars a week and my board!" was her lament. Being a woman, with sixty centuries of women like herself behind her, she never suspected how much more honorably lucrative was her present position than that of the half-starved and maltreated slave of a human brute.

A week ago I was detained by a shower in a fancy store, and dropped into chat with the sad-faced mistress of the neat establishment. A chance comment from me upon the ways of the professional "shopper" led to the usual thing. She "never thought in the days when she lived in her own brownstone front, and kept her carriage, that she would ever be reduced to *this*," etc., etc.

The small merchant (masculine) who should descend to such maundering with a passing stranger would stamp himself as one who deserved to be unsuccessful in any station of life. Until reduced gentlewomen leave their breeding to speak for itself, and, instead of making drafts upon the sympathy of the community because the trade-harness galls their tender shoulders, bear it so gallantly as to enforce respect from those who only see how well they do that which they have chosen—not reluctantly accepted—they cannot complain that their own estimate of their position is assumed as just by people at large.

The dressmaker who goes out by the day, and so hotly resents the indignity of a napkined tray laden with a tempting lunch sent up to the sewing-room that she quits the house and throws up a profitable engagement, is unbusiness-like, and also illogically foolish. She is neither one of the family nor an invited guest. The circumstance of eating from the same board with her employers, with whom she has nothing in common except that they pay her ample wages for making their clothes, lowers, not raises, her in the social scale. The same may be said of the saleswoman who "takes her time," obviously and offensively, in measuring ribbon and making change, to impress an impatient customer, who has to catch a train, with the idea that she is "as good as anybody else and not to be ordered around like a hireling."

These are not cited as unimportant weaknesses to be smiled at, or, at most, despised. They represent sentiments and motives which seriously hinder the working-woman from rendering herself free and independent. She must make labor, and the drawbacks and trials incident to labor, an impersonal matter, and relegate feeling to the sacred domain of the inner life, if she would command success. The moment she takes advantage of the accident of her sex and appeals to sentimentality, instead of justice, she begs the question, and sinks toward pauperism.

Closely contingent upon this fashion of looking backward, and not forward, is the spiritless performance of duties inseparable from the contemned office. It cannot be otherwise. Action, in such a case, is but stony-ground grain, and only kept from withering out of sight by the irrigation of wages.

What, then, is needed to raise up for this generation a class of business women who will dignify their sex and quell the clamor of the prisoners of poverty? First, last, and always, *to undertake the allotted labor with the forceful purpose of performing it as if it were the one and only object in life.*

An editorial writer in the *Christian Union* said lately in a talk with "Business Boys": "The boy who will succeed in the world is he who is content, for a time, to do two dollars' worth of work for a dollar." Business girls need to bind this precept upon heart and hand. Determination to fulfil every obligation thoroughly, in spirit and in letter, should outrank the thought of the money to be made by this particular undertaking. First, excellence of workmanship; then, what price will it command? The girl who

studies book-keeping or stenography as a stop-gap against the tide of impecuniosity until she can wed a bread-and-bonnet-winner, enacts the trite role of the little Haarlem hero with his thumb in the dike leak. She is like one who watches for the morning, and, in proportion as her heart fails at the delay of dawn, interest in her occupation declines. Judging by her standard of values the business laid importunately to her hand and the wedlock that *may* come, we may well remind her that faithfulness in that which is least is the earnest of faithfulness in that which is great. The steadfast industry, the discipline of speech and conduct, the concentration of thought and energy upon the matter set before one for accomplishment, that are essential to business prosperity, are the best conceivable preparation for the high and holy sphere of wife, housekeeper, and mother.

It is more sadly true that the home in which the wife is denied all knowledge of business methods and principles is the worst possible school for the duties which may, which often do, devolve upon a widow. Why practical, long-headed husbands and fathers regard complacently the inability of wives and daughters to audit tradesmen's bills and keep their own personal accounts, is an anomaly of human nature and conduct that usually goes unrebuked. To pursue this system until to full-grown babies and an equally inefficient mother is committed the management of all that stands between them and want, is like demanding from a jelly-fish, left high by the tide, the hardy pugnacity of a warrior-crab.

With the exit of Lydia Languish and Laura Matilda from the stage of every-day life has come the need for better stuff to meet the demands of an age that is terribly in earnest. Fortunes are not now salted down in three-per-cent. consols and other government securities, to await the possible exigencies of wife and children. The more luxurious our girl's home to-day, the likelier she is to be to-morrow among those whose call (I quote from a letter upon my desk) for "work which a woman who was educated to do nothing in particular can handle" comes to the ear of the lover of her sex like the wail of unbaptized babies wandering in the outer darkness. We pity the petitioners; but can we forgive the mistaken fondness that hears in the lamentable cry no warning demand for business education for women?

MARION HARLAND.

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF THE CIVIL WAR.

VII.

BY GENERAL VISCOUNT WOLSELEY, K.P., ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF THE BRITISH ARMY.

THE situation, however discouraging to the North it was for the moment, was soon now about to change. The siege was about to begin that was eventually to entail the fall of the Confederate capital and the capture of Lee's devoted army. By the end of June, 1864, it is not surprising that much pressure was brought to bear upon President Lincoln to remove Grant and, somewhat later, to stop General Sherman's southward movement. It was then that Mr. Lincoln's historic phrase, that he would not "swop horses whilst crossing a stream," settled the policy of the Federal Government. It decided the fate of the war.

If for the moment we turn our attention from the Army of the Potomac to the campaign of General Sherman against General Joseph E. Johnston, we there find plenty of very interesting and instructive matter. It is difficult to believe that the army of which General Johnston assumed command when the campaign began could have been altogether in the splendid condition at that period which is attributed to it by General Hood. It was the same army which had been disastrously defeated by Grant at Chattanooga, and since that event no circumstances had occurred which could have tended to restore its *morale*, heavily shaken as it was by that disaster. There may or may not have been some errors of detail in the disposition of the army for the defence of Rocky-face Mountain, but with forces so superior to him as those of Sherman's were at this period, it is difficult to see how Johnston could have adopted any other rôle than the defensive one he actually assumed. According to the careful cal-

culation of Major Dawes (page 281), his own army stood to Sherman's as 64 to 100 in point of numbers, but certainly in every respect inferior in point of equipment, and more especially in the supply of ammunition. His own estimate, which puts the figures as low as 4 to 10, though it is probably too low, marks, no doubt, his opinion, at the time, of the fighting powers of the two armies. It is not quite fair (as Major Dawes seems to do) to reckon up the casual replacements and reënforcements which reach a general during a campaign as, necessarily, additions to his original strength. The total number of men "to be accounted for" as "available for battle," given by Major Dawes as 84,328, leaves an entirely false impression on the ordinary reader, as though it meant that General Johnston had at some one moment an army of that size under his orders. As regarded his day-to-day fighting strength, he was very much in the position of the man who, with a very inadequate income, should receive small sums of capital at different times which he had to treat as income. In the aggregate those small sums might possibly reach a considerable amount, and if he had received them altogether and early in life, he might have lived handsomely upon the interest. But, as it was, his necessities obliged him to use up from time to time those sums for which critical friends said afterwards he should "account." Without, therefore, attempting to decide too positively between the estimates of General Johnston and of Major Dawes as to the available strength of the Confederate Army, I think it may safely be assumed that the fighting force of General Johnston's army was such that, for the time at least, a defensive and watching position was enforced on him.

It is difficult for a stranger to discuss the character of a country regarding which one of the two opposing generals who fought over it says:

"Mr. Davis and General Sherman exhibit a strange ignorance of the country between Dalton and Atlanta. Mr. Davis describes mountain ridges offering positions neither to be taken nor turned, and a natural fortress eighteen miles in extent, forgetting, apparently, that a fortress is strong only when it has a garrison strong enough for its extent; and both forget that, except Rocky-face, *no mountain is visible from the road between Dalton and Atlanta.*"

Yet in the middle of this very paper we have a picture of the Confederates dragging guns up "Kenesaw Mountain," which certainly conveys the impression that the "mountain" was at least a very steep and considerable hill. According to the map which

faces page 250, "Kenesaw Mountain" looks as if it ought to be pretty clearly visible from the road in question. The whole map indicates a series of ridges which appear to be mountainous. The word "mountain" is also scattered over it almost as thickly as peas in a pod. The words "Chattoogata Mountains," "Horn Mountains," "Pine Mountain," "Carnes Mountain," "Lost Mountain," etc., leave one in utter bewilderment between the meaning of General Johnston's expression and the meaning of the term "mountain" as locally used in those parts. One is obliged, therefore, to follow the campaign at some disadvantage in these respects. However, allowing for all differences as to the views of the writers and map-makers as to what is and is not a mountain, it seems tolerably clear that General Sherman successfully manœuvred Johnston out of his first positions at Dalton. They were not, however, positions which Johnston had any intention to hold seriously, for he very naturally considered them as too extensive for the force under his command.

The one opportunity for striking an offensive blow which presented itself to Johnston occurred at Cassville, and he took every step that was possible to him in order to take advantage of it. Either owing to some misunderstanding on General Hood's part or from some other cause not explained, Johnston's orders were not carried out, but the opportunity was lost through no fault on the part of General Johnston. No other presented itself up to the moment when he was deprived of his command, at which time he was busily engaged in preparing to take advantage of a temporary separation of General Sherman's army into two parts. The defects in execution which attended General Hood's attempt to strike this very blow, which had been suggested to him by Johnston, would have been much less likely to occur had Johnston remained in command. It was for the Confederates a fatal illustration of the danger of "swopping horses," either when you are "crossing a stream" in the figurative sense, or when your enemy is actually crossing a stream and you lose the chance to attack him. It does not seem from these pages that General Johnston can be fairly charged with any undue preference for a purely defensive course of action. In command of an inferior army, he wisely waited on the defensive, watching for time and opportunity to strike back at his skilful adversary. It was the faults of others and the impatience of the Confederate

Government which snatched from his grasp the chances that were presented to him.

In this history he appears simply as the Fabius of the war, whereas he was, in fact, only pursuing a Fabian policy at a time when it was the sole course open to him to avoid certain defeat. Always on the lookout for an opportunity to assume the offensive, he seems to have been always anxious to act in a very different manner from what he did, had circumstances favored his doing so. There are, however, some very interesting points which arise out of the events of this campaign, especially as to the effect which operations like those carried out by Johnston are likely to have upon the fighting value of an army. Many of the ideas and reasons which influenced his action could not have been known to his troops,—a condition of things which from the earliest ages has often turned soldiers against their commander. There has been, unfortunately, so much angry discussion over the events of this campaign, and so many contradictory statements as to fact and so many private reputations are involved, that it is peculiarly difficult to arrive at the truth. In attempting, therefore, to state the case as it is given in *The Century* papers, the military student is obliged to trust very much to his own judgment in the rejection or acceptance of the conflicting statements. One is naturally prejudiced in favor of those which appear to fit in best with the story as a whole and those which are most in accordance with the general experiences of war.

The first question that naturally arises is, What was the state of the Confederate Army when Johnston handed over the command to General Hood? The conclusion to be drawn as to the practical success or failure of Johnston's strategy up to that period will be very much influenced by the answer given to that question. As far as one can judge of the facts from the evidence we derive from General Sherman's own account, together with that supplied by General Johnston and in the main by others, it is that a most difficult task had been set before the Federal Army. It seems abundantly clear that, as long as General Johnston commanded against it, very little success that was of much value had been achieved. But, on the other hand, it is difficult not to attach some importance to the plea put forward by General Hood that the desertions from the Confederate Army had reached a most alarming figure, in consequence of General Johnston's con-

tinued retreat. His war of intrenchments, one line made after another, and always further and further to the rear, though it was terribly annoying to the Federal general, had, it was said, told seriously on the *morale* of the Southern troops.

It seems clear that, if the campaign were to be looked upon merely as a great game of chessmen, Sherman, by his long advance from Chattanooga to Atlanta, had rather weakened than strengthened his position. He seems to admit as much himself when he says: "Johnston had meantime picked up his detachments, and had received reënforcements from his rear which raised his aggregate strength to 62,000 men, and warranted him in claiming that he was purposely drawing us far from our base, and that when the right moment should come he would turn on us and destroy us." (Page 252.) And again: "No officer or soldier who ever served under me will question the generalship of Joseph E. Johnston. His retreats were timely, in good order, and he left nothing behind." (Page 253.) Of course he says also, as any good soldier would, "We were equally confident, and not the least alarmed." (Page 252.) But there is no mistaking the meaning of the sentence, "At this critical moment the Confederate Government rendered us most valuable service. Being dissatisfied with the Fabian policy of General Johnston, it relieved him, and General Hood was substituted to command the Confederate Army." That clearly represents the view of a most able and generous opponent as to the management of the Army of Tennessee by General Johnston, from the beginning of May, 1864, to July 18, 1864, when Hood succeeded to the command. But I do not see that any answer has been made from within the Confederate lines to General Hood's statement (page 336) that when on the night of the 9th of July the Confederate Army crossed the Chattahoochee River, "with one-third of their number lost," the men were "downcast, dispirited, and demoralized. Stragglers and deserters, the captured and killed, could not now, however, be replaced by recruits, because all the recruiting depots had been drained to reënforce either Lee or Johnston."

It is difficult to see what better Johnston could have done than adopt a Fabian policy during this time. If only it were possible to make the rank and file of an army understand the wisdom of such a policy at such a time, and to understand the advantages it would confer if discipline were strictly maintained,

and if its adoption did not tend seriously to discourage them, such a policy would be followed more frequently than it is, and it would often be a sure means to victory in the long run. But there are too many "ifs" in this proposition. The soldier is a human being and not a soulless machine; and a lengthened retreat, no matter how skilfully carried out, has always injured his fighting spirit, and I believe will always do so. The quotations I have already made from General Hood are strengthened by his reference, which can hardly be inaccurate, to the opinion of all his corps commanders. On the 15th of October they expressed the opinion that, although the army "had much improved in spirit, it was not in condition to risk battle against the numbers reported by General Wheeler." (Page 426.) It is true that in the meantime Hood had engaged in a series of offensive operations around Atlanta, but they were, at best, of doubtful value.

Taking the story as a whole, it seems to point out very clearly the practical danger, in its effect upon troops, of the most brilliant series of defensive actions, and that this is especially the case when those actions are fought behind earth-works constructed at each succeeding stage of a campaign, and further and further to the rear. I incline to think that something of the same kind of effect is to be noticed even in the army of General Lee from the time when the long series of earth-work operations began around Petersburg. General Hood's view of the condition of the Army of Tennessee at the time when he took over the command has been so far accepted, because it appears on the whole to be confirmed by other evidence and to be in accordance with the general experience of war in such cases. Moreover, General Sherman, with all his respect for Johnston, speaks of the superior *morale* of his own army at this time. General Hood accounts for his own ill-success on every occasion by pouring out blame upon his subordinate leaders. This sort of explanation cannot be accepted as strictly impartial history. In a recently-published volume of the Duke of Wellington's conversations there is a remark about Napoleon's campaign of 1814, which our great captain, like most educated soldiers, regarded as one of the most brilliant, if not the most brilliant, of all the performances of that great master of the art of war. The Duke, answering some characteristically flippant remark of Croker's on the subject, refers to the series of victories which Napoleon gained over army after

army in that campaign, and then, speaking from his own vast experience, says: "I know *the nice calculation* of time and distance which is necessary to the working-out of such combinations."

Some commanders are said to be "unlucky," which may sometimes mean that fate has really been continuously adverse to them. Far more often, however, it means that, whilst in conception their paper schemes may have been brilliant, they have failed in those nice calculations of time, distance, and other points to which Wellington attributed Napoleon's victories. Hood was certainly an "unlucky" commander. It is unfortunate for his reputation that his old classmates of West Point, represented so largely in the Federal Army opposed to him, should have fully anticipated from the first that he would be "unlucky." In speaking of a general who had been continuously unsuccessful, Lord Beaconsfield said to me: "They say he is unlucky, but my experience leads me to believe that want of luck is too often only a want of skill." It is impossible to say at each point where fate and where miscalculation caused General Hood's ill-luck. His original scheme for moving into the heart of Tennessee, with a view to draw Sherman after him, was dashing in the extreme. It is, however, very difficult to believe that he could have successfully carried his army "through the gaps in the Cumberland Mountains" to "attack Grant in rear" (page 427), and so on to Petersburg, as he appears to have contemplated. This is just one of those elaborate combinations of which Napoleon has said that their only defect is that they never succeed. Fate certainly struck him hard when, having urged that the railway to Decatur should be repaired, and that large supplies of stores should be gathered at Tuscumbia, he found on his arrival that nothing had been done.

This is one of those cases in which the want of one effective military head to the Confederacy, of which I have spoken heretofore, appears to have been disastrous. The Confederacy should have been governed from Lee's headquarters. In any case, it is clear that General Sherman's calculations of time, distance, and the resisting power which the stalwart Thomas would be able to gather in Tennessee against Hood, were right, and that Genera Hood's were fallacious. On the whole, it would seem that, for once at least, fate decided between the commanders with the blind

eyes of Justice. From the moment that General Sherman had decided upon the bold step of allowing Hood to do his worst in the rear of the Federal Army, the march of that army to the sea is a most interesting feat of arms, and had a most decisive effect on the result of the war. He justly urges that its importance did not depend so much on the success of his march from Atlanta to the sea as on the fact that at Savannah, after destroying the resources of the South, he was in a position to join hands with Grant by a march northward from Savannah to Goldsboro'. As he says, after the complete destruction of Hood's army by Thomas on December the 16th, 1864, this march from Savannah was "like the thrust of the sword toward the heart of the human body; each mile of advance swept aside all opposition, consumed the very food on which Lee's army depended for life, and demonstrated a power in the National Government which was irresistible." (Page 259).

Let us now return to the doings of Lee's army, which we left at Cold Harbor after the successful issue of its Wilderness campaign. Unfortunately for the readers of these papers, it requires a good deal of careful collation to get from them a clear picture of that most interesting period between June 3 and June 18, 1864—that is, between the end of the Wilderness battles at Cold Harbor and the time when, on June 18, at 11:30 A.M., Lee in person joined Beauregard before Petersburg. It was then that the siege of Lee's army by Grant may be said to have fairly begun. (Page 543.) It is necessary to compare Beauregard's "Four Days of Battle at Petersburg" with "General Grant on the Siege of Petersburg." In order to realize the circumstances under which at this time General Early was detached into the Shenandoah Valley, General Imboden's account of "The Battle of New Market" must be studied. The movements in the Shenandoah Valley, which, since Lee's retreat from Gettysburg, had led up to the battle of New Market and to the events which followed it, are also of importance. Briefly stated, it may be said that the Shenandoah Valley—one of the possible openings for supply which it was essential for Lee to keep open—had been for the moment secured to him by a success gained by Breckenridge over Sigel on May 15, 1864. It was not an unimportant event, because, during the Wilderness campaign, Lee could not have spared men to stop Sigel had he proved successful. But on

May 21 Hunter superseded Sigel in the command of the Federal forces in the Shenandoah Valley, and began a series of movements which resulted, on June 5, in the defeat of the Confederates at Piedmont. Hunter pushed on with increased forces across the Blue Ridge, and moved upon Lynchburg.

It was under these circumstances that General Early, with Jackson's old corps, was despatched to reënforce the Confederates in the Shenandoah Valley, at the moment when Grant was arranging for the transfer of his army to join Butler before Petersburg. The battle of Cold Harbor had been fought on June 3, 1864, and on June 12 Early was despatched to the Shenandoah Valley. Then followed on that side what was the last offensive effort of the dying Confederacy, Early's march on Washington. By July 12 Early's retreat had begun from before Washington; by September 19 Sheridan had defeated him at Winchester, and on September 22 at Fisher's Hill. Despite an at first successful surprise of Sheridan's forces on October 19, Early's army on that day had been almost annihilated. Its destruction meant that one more of the avenues for food and supply was cut off from Lee's doomed army.

Meantime Grant's army had been transferred to the south of the James River, and for the time the Federal commander seems undoubtedly to have given Lee the slip. The movements began on the very day, June 12, that Early had started for the Shenandoah Valley. Up to this time General Beauregard had completely worsted Butler in all his attempts to employ his army against Petersburg or Richmond. The scheme which Beauregard describes on page 198, under the title of "The Defence of Drewry's Bluff," was proposed by him on May 12, 1864, for the destruction of Butler's army. It seems to have been wise and clever, and, as far as one can judge, it was then *the* scheme most likely to give a brilliant result. General Beauregard's idea was that an immediate, though temporary, transfer of 10,000 men from Lee's army, together with the addition of the troops in Richmond, to his own army south of the James River, would make him strong enough to destroy Butler. After Butler had been disposed of, his plan was that with this combined force he should fall upon the left of Grant's army. Until Butler had been disposed of, Lee was to fall back and take up a defensive position covering Richmond. This plan of operation certainly looks as if it were not only feasi-

ble, but one that would have afforded the best opportunity which the situation offered to the two Confederate armies. If carried out, it would have taken place during the five days' lull which succeeded the battle of Spotsylvania. If we are to judge by the success with which at Drewry's Bluff, on May 16, Beauregard rolled back Butler's army, and the narrowness with which that army avoided destruction,—owing its escape, in fact, to the error of General Whiting,—there does not seem any reason to doubt that General Beauregard's proposal, if vigorously carried out, might have been big with great results for the Confederacy. The only doubt seems to be whether food and transport could have been provided for Lee's already starving soldiers during the movement.

In any case, it seems clear that here again the want of a commander-in-chief over all the Confederate armies interfered with the possible execution of such a plan, and, indeed, it would seem, with any adequate and effective coöperation between the two armies of Lee and Beauregard, till they actually effected their junction. The situation when Grant's army began to reënforce Butler, and the four days' fighting before Petersburg commenced, is very noteworthy. A comparison of General Grant's account of those days' proceedings with that given by General Beauregard will show that, whilst, on the one hand, Lee was not aware that Grant's army had left his front, on the other, the Federals were completely imposed upon by the slender force which was interposed between them and Petersburg. The incident is thoroughly characteristic of the history of war, and suggests, not any hostile criticism of the commanders, but rather a reflection as to the strange conditions under which the command of great bodies of men had to be exercised in a country such as was then the field of operations.

The importance of the advantage which Grant had over Lee in this all-decisive matter of unity of command comes out strikingly here. First, when apparently, on May 12, it might have been possible for a large detachment from Lee's army to reënforce Beauregard, and, after defeating Butler, to join in an attack on Grant—an attack which, if successful, would have had decisive results. In the almost pathetic correspondence (pages 244–245) between Lee and Beauregard, there is in Lee's telegrams something almost like irritation at the fact that General Beauregard

wanted some one at Richmond to give him definite orders as to the force he should then send to Lee. Lee evidently felt that the event was one of such paramount importance that it ought to have been entirely and exclusively in his own hands. Yet he was compelled by a faulty and disastrous system of military administration and command to leave the question in Beauregard's hands. "The result of your delay will be disaster. Butler's troops will be with Grant to-morrow," is the expression of a man intensely anxious, who feels that at a critical moment he can only request assistance from a coequal ally, whilst his opponent has the absolute disposal of all the forces in his theatre of war. It is not to find fault with Beauregard that this is written. His great ability as a general, his loyalty, and his honesty of purpose are beyond criticism. The object is to emphasize the necessity of unity of command in war, for without it success must always be doubtful.

When General Grant, on June 12, began his transfer of force towards Petersburg, it is clear that his success in effecting that movement was due to his being able to act as commander-in-chief of the two armies of Meade and Butler. General Lee, on the other hand, could only act as commander of the Army of Northern Virginia, and was at a disadvantage when he received from Beauregard—to whom he could not send orders—only warnings of what was taking place in his own immediate front. Information so received could not affect Lee's mind with the same force or certainty as the daily collected information received at his own headquarters would have done, had he been the commander in-chief of all the armies in that theatre of war. To those who are not familiar with the systematic working of the headquarters of a large army in these respects, it may be difficult to convey an idea of the enormous practical difference between the two sets of facts. The political exigencies of the moment often render the temptation very strong to adopt some such arrangement as that of the Confederates at this time, in which a sort of general headquarters for the two armies is established at the political capital. It is well, therefore, to insist here upon the important effect which it produced upon this part of the campaign.

The situation in the South at this time, when Bragg was acting as Mr. Davis's "chief of the staff," was almost exactly analogous to the situation at the North until General Grant

took supreme command. During all the time that elapsed between the appointment of General Halleck to a position nominally more dignified, but practically that of chief of the staff to Mr. Lincoln, and the moment when Grant assumed command of all the armies and took the field, General Halleck, in Washington, virtually directed all military operations under the President's authority. Grant reduced Halleck to his proper position, that of staff officer to himself, the commander-in-chief in the field. That in each instance the result was disastrous few who seriously study these papers will deny. There is so much in the arrangement that is plausible to a cabinet of civilians, and as it is one that may entail the most fatal consequences upon a nation, attention cannot be too forcibly drawn to it. To consider it rightly, the circumstances under which Halleck was appointed, apparently very much at the suggestion of General Pope, should be carefully studied. We have no explanation afforded as to the circumstances which led to the appointment of General Bragg, but probably they were very similar to those of which we have in General Pope's paper a full account in the case of General Halleck.

The final struggle now fairly began. The fate of Lee's army, despite the heroic resistance which it offered and the alternate successes and failures of the Crater battle and the sally against Fort Stedman, was being surely decided by events beyond its own immediate field. The fall of Fort Fisher on January 15, 1865, cut off an avenue of supply without which Lee had declared it would be impossible to feed his army. The advance of Sherman's army and the destruction of General Early in the Shenandoah Valley were events that closed in the net tighter and tighter around Lee's army, until, as Sherman says (page 259), by March, 1865, there was only one move left to Lee, viz., to abandon Richmond, join Johnston in North Carolina, and, if possible, destroy Sherman, and then turn upon Grant. General Sherman assumes that political considerations alone deterred Lee from carrying out this programme, although Sherman himself suggests that its success was problematical at best. All the evidence goes to show that Lee's troops were already starving, and almost without any means of transport. He, therefore, most probably did not attempt this move because he knew it had become impossible. After General Sheridan's gallant attack upon and capture of Five Forks from the famished and broken men of the old Army of Northern Vir-

ginia, the impossible had then to be attempted by Lee, and it soon become apparent how hopeless was the attempt. The military interest of the great struggle was over; the forces had become too unequal. The closing scenes were strikingly dramatic in their character; but all operations that could be of interest to the military critic ended long before Appomattox Court-House was reached.

The perusal of these papers has revived my remembrance of this great struggle and of the impressions it left upon me at the time. The routine of military duty had stationed me in the neighboring Dominion of Canada while this mighty fight was going on. It is not easy to describe the breathless interest and excitement with which from month to month, almost from day to day, we English soldiers read and studied every report that could be obtained of the war as it proceeded. No doubt many of our impressions of the facts, as we received them at the moment, required to be corrected by subsequent investigation. It takes a long time before the facts can be thoroughly threshed out from the mass of evidence bearing upon the complicated events of a great war that spread over a mighty continent. Nevertheless, in one respect, at all events, the broad impressions then formed are confirmed by the conclusions since arrived at, both from the more elaborate histories and from this most valuable series of papers. I refer to the opinion that, amid the crowds of able men, of gallant soldiers, and of clever statesmen whom the epoch of the American Civil War produced, the two men Abraham Lincoln and Robert Lee stand out a head and shoulders above all others. Neither of them was free from human error. Experience and the teaching of history warn us that perfection is a myth. But how great were both of these two great men in their several spheres! How modest, how wise, how self-restrained, how generous, how large in their views, and how grandly patriotic, as each understood patriotism!

An eminent Greek master taught that mortals are to be judged happy or otherwise according to the ending of their lives. Judging by this test, is it Abraham Lincoln or Robert Lee that we should regard as the favorite of the gods? It was Mr. Lincoln's fate to be struck down by the assassin at the moment when the cause for which he had lived and struggled had absolutely

triumphed—a circumstance which has forever identified his death with the life of his country. Was this a nobler death than Lee's? He, the foremost man in the Confederacy, the General, the idol of the South, retired from his high command to a private, a humble position. He refused repeated offers of wealth and comfort, in order to devote his remaining years to serve his ruined State in the way in which he believed he could be most useful to it—namely, the education of her sons and the training of her citizens, by his great example, to have faith in Virginia's future. One hardly knows which ending the Greek master of old would have admired the more.

One other remark before closing this series of articles, which have at least afforded me most interesting work, whether my humble criticism shall or shall not be profitable to others. I make it with considerable diffidence, both because I am a soldier and because I am not a citizen of the United States. As a soldier, it may be thought that I am prejudiced in what I say, and as an Englishman, that I can only speak of the effect of the great American Civil War from the outside rather than from within. What I have to say is that if one were compelled to choose between condoling with American friends on the terrible misfortunes they underwent in that war, or of congratulating them upon the ennobling effect which that war has had upon their people, one would unhesitatingly congratulate them upon the fact that such stirring and ennobling incidents as those which fill the volumes I have reviewed did occur in American history, a quarter of a century ago.

It has been said—foolishly, I think—that the nation is happy whose annals are uninteresting. If anything so preposterous could be true, we should thank God to have been born in a country every page of whose history was replete with heart-stirring events. To eat the fruits of the ground in a warm, balmy climate, with all sorts of comforts round one, may furnish the materials for a happy, passive, uneventful, almost vegetable existence in equatorial Africa. But would there be any pride in belonging to the Anglo-Saxon race if we had no Crécy, Agincourt, Armada, or other glorious achievement of our ancestors to look back upon? What would England be if there had been no Marlborough, no Wellington, no Nelson, no Chatham, Pitt, or Clive, or Warren Hastings—no "men of action"? And since the

greatest writers have always breathed the patriotic spirit of their own times, no Shakespeare, no Milton either? How could any Miltons or Shakespeares have been born in a country of purely bovine delights, whose history was a blank? Without war, there would, in fact, be no history at all. And yet, without any doubt, the statesman or the soldier who would not devote all his energies to save his country from what all must regard as the appalling calamity of civil war, or indeed from any war, would be an unprincipled villain. But when all has been done that can be done by statesmen or soldiers to stave off the calamity, surely the effects of war upon the country are not all bad. It is a fearful evil, but an evil for which greater good often compensates. Would the United States now prefer to have had no Washington, no Lincoln, none of the many heroes of the War of Independence and of the Civil War, in order to blot out the record of all war from the pages of its history? Would it be better for the future generations of American citizens that, as mere characters, all such heroes as Robert Lee and Stonewall Jackson should never have lived and fought?

In the nation that has never gone through the fiery ordeal of war,—if there be such a nation,—that has never had to encounter circumstances of difficulty and of danger which have threatened its very existence, that has never endured calamities which have tested its men's fibre, there can be no great characters, no lofty figures. It is not a noble, a glorious, or an admirable epoch in the history of any people when the great hero of the hour is the best platform orator or the best money-grubber.

I close the pages of this volume with a sincere feeling of thankfulness and pride that I belong to the race from which sprang the soldiers and sailors who fought upon both sides in this memorable struggle. Who can say which to admire the more—the Southern pluck and daring, or the stern, sober determination which eventually led the North to victory?

WOLSELEY.

LORD WOLSELEY ANSWERED.

BY GENERAL JAMES B. FRY.

LORD WOLSELEY'S comments upon the Civil War should be read in the light of the fact, announced in his fourth article, that they are based entirely upon the accounts given in the book called "Battles and Leaders of the Civil War."

That remarkable work is a record of what the principal actors on both sides of a great war said of their own deeds some twenty years after the contest. It is hardly necessary to mention that such a record is fallible, as well as valuable. The "War Book" is not a history of the Civil War. On the other hand, it is not merely a compilation of careless fireside stories of old soldiers in retirement. It is a record of the deliberate testimony of the principal witnesses in a great trial of arms, given to the world with the soldier's certificate of honor, and set down under the advice and guidance of counsel. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Buel, the editors under whom the "War Book" was prepared, soon became, if they were not in the beginning, experts in matters of the Civil War, and were, in fact, able and impartial counsel for their contributors. The articles were written and published in good faith, but they are *ex parte*, not all correct, and not conclusive. The work is without a parallel, and is of the greatest value and interest; but just criticism of the Civil War calls for a full consideration of all the evidence, the general accounts of the period, diaries, memoirs, etc., and especially the official records,—the testimony which the "War Book" witnesses and others gave at the time.

Lord Wolseley's purpose is to draw military lessons for his own people, and for that the "War Book" may be sufficient. A military lesson may be deduced from an assumed or an established case; but reputations can be fairly dealt with only in the latter. The facts should be collected from all quarters before actors, whether civil or military, in the field or in the bureau, are

convicted. While Lord Wolseley will not dispute this principle, he has not adhered rigidly to it.

For example, his condemnation of Halleck is unsparing ; he blames him for conveying to Meade the President's displeasure at the failure to pursue Lee vigorously ; and, without any knowledge of what Halleck did say, condemns him for not saying to the President certain brave things, which he now thinks Halleck ought to have said ; and taunts him by adding : "What pursuit had Halleck carried out after Shiloh ? Of all men in the war, Halleck was the last who ought to have reproached another man for not adequately reaping the fruits of victory."

The truth is, Halleck had nothing to do with the battle of Shiloh or the pursuit which was not carried out. That was in Grant's hands. Halleck was at St. Louis, hundreds of miles away, when the battle was fought, and did not reach the field for nearly a week after the fight was over and the enemy was within his lines at Corinth.

Without undertaking to present Halleck's case, it is only fair to note that he was dead long before the "*Century* War Book" was thought of ; and that there is nothing in that book which was written in his behalf. As Lord Wolseley's criticisms of him are based wholly upon that authority, his Lordship has in this instance condemned a fellow-soldier without a hearing. Lord Wolseley says : "No one who has himself realized the practical difficulties of command in the field is much inclined to any slap-dash criticism of those who are engaged in high command." It would be hard to find a more striking example of the "slap-dash criticism," which Lord Wolseley disclaims, than his treatment of Halleck presents.

It must, I think, be admitted that Lord Wolseley's military criticisms upon the war, *as he sees it through the Century articles,* are, in general, sound ; and in presenting them he has made an interesting contribution to the profession. It is a merit in his work that he recognizes and sets forth the influence of the navy upon the contest. While special feats of that branch of the service have been chronicled and duly credited, the public mind has never fully taken in the real effect of the navy's part upon joint operations, upon the glory of particular generals, and upon the final result of the contest. Lord Wolseley has rendered an important service in giving prominence to this point.

The one great lesson which Lord Wolseley sees in our Civil War is that civil rulers should not meddle in military affairs.

"It is the old, old story over again," he says, "of civil rulers who blunder, and, failing to foresee events, sacrifice everything to a momentary popularity, in order to divert popular wrath from themselves to the unfortunate soldiers who have been their victims." "The lesson which is most impressed upon me by a study of these campaigns is the danger there always is of popular irritability and ignorant impatience preventing a general from doing the very thing which would, if time were allowed, surely gain the ends which the people desire."

Is not this, in the free countries of Great Britain and the United States, complaining of the inevitable? "Let us clearly understand," Lord Wolseley says, "that the prisoner at the bar is 'Public Opinion,'" "that hoary-headed and cruel old rascal," who is "entirely ignorant," but who issues "decrees" upon which governments are compelled to act. That "prisoner" is not subject to military jurisdiction. Soldiers may bring him before courts-martial as a witness, but not as a prisoner. Is it worth while for them to spend time in England or the United States trying to sentence or silence him? That President Lincoln was "compelled to act" by the decrees of public opinion, and that he was forced to say to McClellan, "Once more let us tell you, it is indispensable to *you* that you strike a blow! I am powerless to help this," is quite true. The practical questions are, What should the soldier have done? What did he do under this "decree," whether the "ignorant old rascal, public opinion," ought to have issued the decree or not?

Lord Wolseley treats the subject as if the war was a strictly military question which could have been settled by one or two pitched battles if the military leaders had had their own way; and he seems to think they ought to have been permitted to decide how many soldiers their governments should raise, how much time should be spent in preparing them for the work in hand, and when, where, and how the work should be done. That is about the view General McClellan took of the subject. He proposed to take all the time he thought necessary for preparation and then, as he said, "crush the rebels in one campaign." But the war was not a technical or professional one. It was a civil war, a resort to arms upon a principle by the people of two sections of the country separated practically by the slave-line, without an army on either side at the beginning. No battle, or two or three battles, however great or how-

ever decisive as mere feats of arms, could have greatly hastened the result. The questions at issue, the character and relations to each other of the people engaged, and the vast extent and natural features and resources of the South enforced upon the North a war of exhaustion and occupation. There were about twenty-three millions of whites in the North, to about five millions in the South ; but the productive interests of the South were cared for by a thoroughly-organized, well-trained, and efficient labor system composed of about three millions and a half of docile blacks born to slavery and brought up to work, males and females alike, in the field or elsewhere at the will of their masters. Assuming, as I do, that the North was bound to succeed, conquest and occupation were inevitable. That required time, and imposed upon the North what Lord Wolseley speaks of as the "continued and systematic process of attrition applied by the Northern generals." This process of "attrition" was not a form of generalship which the Northern commanders were at liberty to accept or reject. It was a condition of things to which Northern generals were obliged to apply the art of war.

Speaking of the organization of the Army of the Potomac by McClellan, Lord Wolseley says :

"That most cruel tyrant, the 'public,' had no means of realizing the difficulties to be overcome. . . . As the months of 1862 went by, the universal feeling was one of restlessness and impatience at what was deemed the waste of time and the useless delay which were taking place. Under this impression, and under the force which this so-formed Public Opinion was exciting, the administration at Washington found itself forced to act."

This was a condition of things for the military leader in a republic to respect, not to resent. McClellan at first knew that, but soon after he reached Washington and took command he seemed to forget that he was a subordinate general of the Republic, and to become completely dominated by the belief that he had been chosen by Providence as the saviour of his country. That was fatal to him. He reached Washington July 26, an able, energetic, trusted young general. By October Washington was quite well fortified, and a great army, organized, armed, equipped, and fairly well drilled,—outnumbering the enemy two or three to one —rested behind its line of intrenchments. The offensive was demanded from all quarters and in all ways, soldiers as well as civilians making the demand. McClellan would not move. He

remained stationary until the enemy, to whom he was vastly superior in numbers and preparation, moved off in February.

So, too, notwithstanding the "decrees," did McClellan have his own way in the plan of campaign. The President advocated the direct overland route; McClellan the Peninsula route. The latter was adopted, the campaign failed, and Lord Wolseley says Mr. Lincoln "wrecked an ably-devised plan for the advance upon Richmond of all the available Federal forces by one single line," etc.

The Peninsula campaign failed on account of delays arising from natural obstacles and because McClellan did not handle his army to advantage. Upon any line adopted he was sure to find the main Confederate army between him and Richmond. The movement to the Peninsula necessarily divided his own forces and concentrated those of the enemy, and in the end he was forced against intrenchments quite as formidable as those he dreaded at Manassas. The Peninsula line, however, was a true one. It afforded two immediate objectives—the rebel army and the rebel capital. Furthermore, it enabled the coöperation of the navy and required but a short line of supply, about twelve miles by railroad.

It cannot be said to a certainty that the detention of McDowell's corps by the President did or did not prevent McClellan's success on the Peninsula; but it must be borne in mind that Franklin's division of McDowell's corps was, at McClellan's urgent request, sent to him after only a week's delay, and McCall's division of that corps was sent to him and arrived while he was on the Chickahominy; thus giving him the best two-thirds of McDowell's corps, before the enemy drove him to the James River.

McClellan himself practically admits that the detention of troops for the security of Washington was not the cause of his failure, by giving in his "own story," long after the war, a specific and different cause. It is this: On May 18 the Secretary of War addressed a letter to McClellan in reply to a call for McDowell's corps to be sent by water, in which the Secretary said:

"The President is not willing to uncover the capital entirely, and it is believed that, even if this were prudent, it would require more time to effect a junction between your army and that of the Rappahannock by way of the Potomac and York rivers than by a land march. In order, therefore, to increase the strength of the attack upon Richmond at the earliest moment, General McDowell has been ordered to march upon that city by the shortest route. He is ordered, keeping himself always

in position to save the capital from all possible attack, so to operate as to put his left wing in communication with your right wing, and you are instructed to co-operate so as to establish this communication as soon as possible, by extending your right wing to the north of Richmond."

McClellan says in his own story:

"This order rendered it impossible for me to use the James River as a line of operations, *forced me to establish our depots on the Pamunky and to approach Richmond from the north. Herein lay the failure of the campaign.* As it was impossible to get at Richmond and the enemy's army covering it without crossing the Chickahominy, I was obliged to divide the Army of the Potomac into two parts separated by the river."

There is the cause of his failure clearly and deliberately stated by McClellan himself long after the war. It refutes the charge that the detention of troops for the safety of Washington was the cause. But, strange to say, McClellan's statement that he was forced by Stanton's letter of May 18 to establish his depots on the Pamunky, etc., is erroneous. Lord Wolseley has accepted the foregoing statement from McClellan and says of Stanton:

"It was he who thrust forward the force under McDowell, and *so entailed upon McClellan the necessity of placing himself in that false position astride of the Chickahominy which led to all the misfortunes of this campaign.*"

The facts of record are that McClellan had established his depots on the Pamunky before Stanton's telegram of May 18 was sent. He had taken locomotives and cars in his transports for the purpose of using the railroad from White House to Richmond as his line of operations. He arrived in person at White House on May 16, having then passed the last point at which he could turn towards the James River, and wrote to his wife, May 17, "We expect to have our advance parties near Bottom's bridge today," said all the bridges were burned, but that "this river is fordable, so the difficulty is not insurmountable by any means"; showing that he intended to encounter the Chickahominy, but did not expect it to be a serious obstacle. On the 18th of May he wrote: "We will go to Dunnstall's or perhaps a little beyond it, and will soon close up on the Chickahominy, and find out what Secesh is doing. I think we will fight us *there, or between there and Richmond.*" Here was McClellan, with his depots on the Pamunky and his troops on the Chickahominy, expecting a battle "*between there and Richmond,*" before the letter of May 18, which, he says, forced him to the Pamunky and Chickahominy, was written. It is not only true that he was there without orders from Washington, but it is also true that before leaving Washing-

ton he intended to go there. In a report to the Secretary of War, dated March 19, he said :

"I have the honor to submit the following notes on the proposed operations of the active portion of the Army of the Potomac. The proposed plan of campaign is to assume Fort Monroe as the first base of operations, *taking the line of Yorktown and West Point upon Richmond as the line of operations*, Richmond being the objective point. It is assumed that the fall of Richmond involves that of Norfolk and the whole of Virginia; *also that we shall fight a decisive battle between West Point and Richmond. It is also clear that West Point should, as soon as possible, be reached and used as our main depot.*"

There the objective, the base, the main depot, and the line of operations—upon which he expected to fight a decisive battle "between West Point and Richmond"—are laid down with mathematical and soldierly accuracy by McClellan himself before leaving Washington, and he indicated no purpose to change the base, depot, or line until the enemy turned his right flank late in June. To this it might be added that there is nothing to show that McClellan, at the time, or when giving his testimony to the Committee on the Conduct of the War concerning the cause of failure, asserted or pretended that he was forced to the Pamunky and Chickahominy, or that he had any objection to that base and line. Instead, therefore, of being forced to that "false position astride of the Chickahominy" by Stanton's letter of May 18, the position was deliberately assumed upon McClellan's own judgment.

Lord Wolseley says :

' The one just defence which McClellan is able to offer for the dangerous division of his army astride the Chickahominy is that, according to his statement,—and it is undisputed,—that distribution of his troops was expressly ordered from Washington, the object being that he might keep in communication with the force under McDowell."

Having proved, as I think, that McClellan himself chose his base, his depot, and his line of operations, and placed himself upon the Chickahominy before the order of May 18 was issued (which is relied upon wholly as the order of the Washington authorities in the case), and it being the fact that he promptly put his army astride the Chickahominy on May 20 by his own orders, it seems unnecessary to say more upon that point. The case does not sustain Lord Wolseley's lesson against governmental interference with generals in the field, or the assertion that Lincoln wrecked McClellan's ably-devised campaign.

Lord Wolseley speaks with proper commendation of the Confederate attack upon McClellan's left, called the battle of Seven

Pines, and remarks, very justly: "All that failed was the execution." He says: "The moment selected for the attack was happily chosen immediately after the river had risen in sudden flood." While this statement concerning the time chosen is not to be contradicted, it calls, on historical grounds, for some qualification. When Johnston ordered the attack on April 30, the Chickahominy was high, but McClellan had several bridges by which he could cross to support his left wing. During the night of the 30th–31st, *after the attack had been ordered,* the rain fell in torrents, thus swelling the stream so that bridges were swept away next day, and the Union left was greatly imperilled. Lord Wolseley says:

"General Longstreet's division was so long in getting into position and preparing for attack that the whole scheme of General J. E. Johnston miscarried;" and elsewhere: "Nothing could have enabled the Federal forces to the north of the Chickahominy to arrive in time to support the left, or the left to escape over the Chickahominy, if the Confederate corps had taken their proper directions."

This conclusion may be questioned. The Federal forces north of the Chickahominy would have moved to the support of the left as soon as they received notice of the attack, just as they did move at 2 P.M., and if the attack had been made as early as intended, the Federals would have had one more bridge to cross upon, and roads less rain-soaked to move over. The failure probably was not due to the time of the attack or the time of the arrival of supports for the Federal left. It is attributable to the fact that Longstreet's division was not brought to bear upon Keyes's right flank—the weak part of the line.

Two main roads, the Williamsburg road and the Nine-Mile road, lying at safe and convenient distances apart, led from the Confederate camp, and intersected at the point occupied by Keyes's right, thus enabling an easy concentration of the Confederates for attack. The Nine-Mile road led directly to the exposed Federal flank. When the attack was ordered (April 30), Longstreet's division was on the Nine-Mile road; and it was ordered to proceed to the attack by that road, while D. H. Hill's division was ordered to attack by the Williamsburg road, upon which it was lying. This would have concentrated a powerful force upon the Federals, bringing Longstreet upon their weakest point. But instead of proceeding by the Nine-Mile road, as directed, Longstreet marched his division across to the Williamsburg road and fell in behind Hill. That was the gravest fault in execution which marks the affair.

Lord Wolseley's picture of the military situation and the magical effect of McClellan's assumption of command after Pope's defeat is graphic and highly colored, but somewhat misleading. He speaks of the "abject panic," and says (of McClellan):

"As the disorganization of the army was directly attributable to his absence from it so his presence with it—hailed as it was by all ranks—was, of itself, sufficient to restore it to order and efficiency." "All at once he heard nothing around him but enthusiastic demands to be led forward to victory from the very men who, till he joined them, were only seeking safety in individual flight."

There is no good ground for the assertion that the "disorganization of the army was directly attributable" to McClellan's "absence from it"; but the main point for consideration here—which Lord Wolseley seems to have overlooked—is that the Army of the Potomac had not been defeated or disorganized in Pope's campaign. Only a little more than one corps of that army had been seriously engaged under Pope, and though that fraction had suffered heavily, it had lost neither spirit nor organization. The other corps of the Army of the Potomac were in good order, and had not been engaged since the seven-days' fight on the Peninsula, nearly two months before. They constituted the main body of the army which McClellan led forth with promptness and energy to battle with Lee, who was moving into Maryland. It was, in fact, McClellan's own army from the Peninsula, not Pope's army from Manassas.

At that time McClellan was himself. The lash of adversity had subdued the fancy that he was the chosen saviour, and left at work in him nothing but the general that he really was. On the 7th of September he wrote his wife: "The feeling of the government toward me, I am sure, is kind and trusting. I hope by God's blessing to justify the confidence they now repose in me, and will bury the past in oblivion." But as soon as the Battle of Antietam was over, ten days later (September 17), the saviour hallucination again took precedence, and he began to seek the suppression of the authorities set over him by his country, calling them "difficulties" in his path. On the 20th of September he wrote:

"I feel some little pride in having, with a beaten and demoralized army, defeated Lee so utterly and saved the North so completely. Since I left Washington Stanton has again asserted that I, not Pope, lost the battle of Manassas No. 2! I am tired of fighting against such disadvantages, and feel that it is now time for the country to *come to my help* and *remove these difficulties from my path.* I feel that I have done all that can be asked in *twice saving the country.* If I continue in its service I have

at least, the right to demand a guarantee that I shall not be interfered with. I know I cannot have that assurance as long as Stanton continues in the position of Secretary of War, and Halleck as General-in-Chief."

The subordinate general commanding in the field, who announced on the 7th the "kind feeling" and "great confidence" of the government, and "buried the past in oblivion," after two weeks of military success was again the Saviour of the Country, demanding the removal from his path of the Secretary of War and the General-in-Chief! The result was six weeks of exasperating and contentious delay on the Potomac, followed, a few days later, by his removal from command when on the march, at the time of all times that he ought not to have been removed or interfered with.

Lord Wolseley's comments upon the great operations of the last two years of the war, especially Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, Vicksburg, and Gettysburg, are so meagre as to be disappointing.

He says that Stoneman's raid caused the "loss of the battle of Chancellorsville," adding: "The more one considers that battle, the more clear it becomes that it was the absence of the Federal cavalry which made possible Jackson's turning movement." His Lordship has not seized what seem to me to be the controlling facts. Stoneman's movement was a proper part of a good plan. It left Hooker enough cavalry under Pleasanton to serve as "eyes" for the army. If the presence of Stoneman's cavalry would have prevented the division of the enemy's forces,—Jackson making a fifteen-mile march around the Federal army,—Hooker ought to have been thankful that it was away. But, instead of beating Lee's army in detail, he devoted all his energy and four days to slipping out from between the two parts of it, doing them as little harm as practicable in getting away. "Fighting Joe" was demoralized. Why it was so is not to be discussed here; but the lesson of that battle, as I view the subject, is not that it was a blunder to send Stoneman's cavalry to break Lee's communications.

Lord Wolseley closes his fourth article by saying:

"The decisions from Washington and the criticisms from Washington, based upon the loose and rampant public opinion of the day, were in every instance wrong, and were disastrous to the cause of the Union"; and he warns "the survivors* of the

***Probably misprint, meaning successors.**

administration" against "interference in the conduct of war—the most difficult of all arts—without any knowledge of its methods or of its principles."

Both the assertion and the admonition seem too broad. It is not to be admitted that the "decisions" and "criticisms" from Washington were "in every instance wrong, and were disastrous to the Union"; nor is it sound doctrine, as implied, that the government should be silent about military operations. Perhaps the rule should be for the administration to speak plainly and positively concerning the object and general scope of the campaign. After that, the discretion and individual responsibility of the general should not be curtailed by orders, nor should he be disturbed by perplexing advice. But popular governments do not always adhere to such rules; and departures from them, real or alleged, give rise to disputes in which there may be, and generally are, right and wrong on both sides.

The glory of military success goes to the general in the field; but in case of defeat the blame is likely to be thrown upon the home government, if it has given an order by which the general can claim that he was controlled or influenced. Yet failure may result from bad plans and from badly-executed good orders, as well as from bad orders. In the matter of the relative merit of the orders he issued and the way they were executed, Lincoln's record will bear the closest scrutiny. The subject is too extensive and too technical for more than a brief notice here. Lincoln's so-called wrecking of McClellan's plans has already been sketched.

Burnside succeeded McClellan at Warrentown, November 9, 1862. His career as commander of the Army of the Potomac ended with the disastrous affair of Fredericksburg, and he was removed January 25, 1863. It is unjust to charge Burnside's failure to Halleck, as Lord Wolseley does. Burnside's plan of campaign and plan of battle were his own. In his report to Halleck, dated December 17, 1863, he says:

"The fact that I decided to move from Warrentown on to this line, rather against the opinion of the President, Secretary, and yourself, and that you have left the whole management in my hands without giving me orders, makes me the more responsible, . . . The movement was made earlier than you expected, and after the President, Secretary, and yourself requested me not to be in haste."

Instead of resorting to this official report, made at the time by Burnside himself, sustaining the administration and Halleck, Lord Wolseley condemns them, and depicts Halleck as a military demagogue, upon a story told in the "Century War Book" by a

Confederate officer of a conversation he says he had with Burnside under a flag of truce, while sitting "on a log," "provided with crackers, cheese, sardines, and a bottle of brandy."

The case of Fredericksburg is a bad one for Lord Wolseley's lesson of non-interference with the general in the field. Chancellorsville is not much better. Burnside was replaced by Hooker January 25, 1863. The next day Lincoln wrote Hooker a remarkable letter, in which he said:

"Only those generals who gain successes can set up dictators. What I now ask of you is military success, and I will risk the dictatorship. . . . Beware of rashness, but with energy and sleepless vigilance go forward and give us victories."

Hooker made his own plans, took the initiative, turned Lee's left, drew him out of his stronghold on the heights of Fredericksburg, and, with advantage of position and two men to the enemy's one, stole back to his camp without really fighting a battle.

Hooker was succeeded by Meade, who won the battle of Gettysburg. Lincoln knew that by the successes at Vicksburg and Gettysburg the contest was practically decided in our favor, and he desired a vigorous pursuit. On the 6th of July he expressed himself accordingly to Halleck. Undoubtedly Lincoln's action is in the nature of interference with the general in the field, but there was nothing "disastrous to the Union" in it.

When by the 16th of October (1863) nothing had been accomplished by Meade since the battle of Gettysburg, Lincoln wrote Halleck:

"If General Meade can now attack him [Lee] on a field no more than equal for us, and will do so with all the skill and courage which he, his officers and men possess, the honor will be his if he succeeds, and the blame may be mine if he fails."

If this was interference, it was of a manly kind. Nothing came of it.

Soon after this Grant assumed general control of all military operations, and personal supervision in Virginia. I have never seen it stated that he was unduly interfered with.

It cannot be disputed that there was some interference with military operations by the Washington authorities, due partly to popular clamor. In my judgment, however, it was not so frequent or so injurious as represented, and, good or bad, the advice given was sometimes unavoidable, because it was asked for.

Burnside was so communicative that Halleck found it necessary to telegraph him (December 10, 1863): "I beg you not to

telegraph details of your plans, nor the time of your intended movements. No secret can be kept that passes through so many hands." It was in response to a despatch from Hooker, sent when Lee was moving from his front for the Gettysburg campaign, that Lincoln advised—wisely, I think—against crossing the Rappahannock to attack the Confederate rear-guard. Lord Wolseley says of this incident:

"The mere suggestion by Hooker that to attack Lee's right was the proper course to pursue was sufficient to cause the removal of that general from his command."

This is incorrect and unjust. No penalty was imposed upon Hooker for the suggestion to attack Lee's right, except the clear exposition by Lincoln of the folly of such a movement. His removal was determined upon long before the suggestion was made. Special causes delayed it some weeks. Late in June, Hooker applied to be relieved, and his application was promptly granted June 28, the cause being the unfitness he had shown at Chancellorsville.

Time only can test the correctness of Lord Wolseley's prediction that for "most of the misfortunes experienced by the Federal troops, the verdict of history will ultimately hold responsible the administration at Washington rather than the generals who commanded in the field." I do not believe it. His conclusion (whether consistent or not with his prediction) that "amid the crowds of able men, of gallant soldiers, and of clever statesmen whom the epoch of the American Civil War produced, the two men Abraham Lincoln and Robert Lee stand out a head and shoulders above all others," may be contested as to Lee, but never as to Lincoln.

JAMES B. FRY.

WHY AM I AN AGNOSTIC?

BY ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

PART I.

"With thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls."

The same rules or laws of probability must govern in religious questions as in others. There is no subject—and can be none—concerning which any human being is under any obligation to believe without evidence. Neither is there any intelligent being who can, by any possibility, be flattered by the exercise of ignorant credulity. The man who, without prejudice, reads and understands the Old and New Testaments will cease to be an orthodox Christian. The intelligent man who investigates the religion of any country without fear and without prejudice will not and cannot be a believer.

Most people, after arriving at the conclusion that Jehovah is not God, that the Bible is not an inspired book, and that the Christian religion, like other religions, is the creation of man, usually say: "There must be a Supreme Being, but Jehovah is not his name, and the Bible is not his word. There must be somewhere an over-ruling Providence or Power."

This position is just as untenable as the other. He who cannot harmonize the cruelties of the Bible with the goodness of Jehovah, cannot harmonize the cruelties of Nature with the goodness and wisdom of a supposed Deity. He will find it impossible to account for pestilence and famine, for earthquake and storm, for slavery, for the triumph of the strong over the weak, for the countless victories of injustice. He will find it impossible to account for martyrs—for the burning of the good, the noble, the loving, by the ignorant, the malicious, and the infamous.

How can the Deist satisfactorily account for the sufferings of women and children? In what way will he justify religious

persecution—the flame and sword of religious hatred? Why did his God sit idly on his throne and allow his enemies to wet their swords in the blood of his friends? Why did he not answer the prayers of the imprisoned, of the helpless? And when he heard the lash upon the naked back of the slave, why did he not also hear the prayer of the slave? And when children were sold from the breasts of mothers, why was he deaf to the mother's cry?

It seems to me that the man who knows the limitations of the mind, who gives the proper value to human testimony, is necessarily an Agnostic. He gives up the hope of ascertaining first or final causes, of comprehending the supernatural, or of conceiving of an infinite personality. From out the words Creator, Preserver, and Providence, all meaning falls.

The mind of man pursues the path of least resistance, and the conclusions arrived at by the individual depend upon the nature and structure of his mind, on his experience, on hereditary drifts and tendencies, and on the countless things that constitute the difference in minds. One man, finding himself in the midst of mysterious phenomena, comes to the conclusion that all is the result of design; that back of all things is an infinite personality—that is to say, an infinite man; and he accounts for all that is by simply saying that the universe was created and set in motion by this infinite personality, and that it is miraculously and supernaturally governed and preserved. This man sees with perfect clearness that matter could not create itself, and therefore he imagines a creator of matter. He is perfectly satisfied that there is design in the world, and that consequently there must have been a designer. It does not occur to him that it is necessary to account for the existence of an infinite personality. He is perfectly certain that there can be no design without a designer, and he is equally certain that there can be a designer who was not designed. The absurdity becomes so great that it takes the place of a demonstration. He takes it for granted that matter was created and that its creator was not. He assumes that a creator existed from eternity, without cause, and created what is called matter out of nothing; or, whereas there was nothing, this creator made the something that we call substance.

Is it possible for the human mind to conceive of an infinite personality? Can it imagine a beginningless being, infinitely powerful and intelligent? If such a being existed, then there must

have been an eternity during which nothing did exist except this being; because, if the universe was created, there must have been a time when it was not, and back of that there must have been an eternity during which nothing but an infinite personality existed. Is it possible to imagine an infinite intelligence dwelling for an eternity in infinite nothing? How could such a being be intelligent? What was there to be intelligent about? There was but one thing to know, namely, that there was nothing except this being. How could such a being be powerful? There was nothing to exercise force upon. There was nothing in the universe to suggest an idea. Relations could not exist—except the relation between infinite intelligence and infinite nothing.

The next great difficulty is the act of creation. My mind is so that I cannot conceive of something being created out of nothing. Neither can I conceive of anything being created without a cause. Let me go one step further. It is just as difficult to imagine something being created with, as without, a cause. To postulate a cause does not in the least lessen the difficulty. In spite of all, this lever remains without a fulcrum. We cannot conceive of the destruction of substance. The stone can be crushed to powder, and the powder can be ground to such a fineness that the atoms can only be distinguished by the most powerful microscope, and we can then imagine these atoms being divided and subdivided again and again and again; but it is impossible for us to conceive of the annihilation of the least possible imaginable fragment of the least atom of which we can think. Consequently the mind can imagine neither creation nor destruction. From this point it is very easy to reach the generalization that the indestructible could not have been created.

These questions, however, will be answered by each individual according to the structure of his mind, according to his experience, according to his habits of thought, and according to his intelligence or his ignorance, his prejudice or his genius.

Probably a very large majority of mankind believe in the existence of supernatural beings, and a majority of what are known as the civilized nations, in an infinite personality. In the realm of thought majorities do not determine. Each brain is a kingdom, each mind is a sovereign.

The universality of a belief does not even tend to prove its truth. A large majority of mankind have believed in what is known

as God, and an equally large majority have as implicitly believed in what is known as the Devil. These beings have been inferred from phenomena. They were produced for the most part by ignorance, by fear, and by selfishness. Man in all ages has endeavored to account for the mysteries of life and death, of substance, of force, for the ebb and flow of things, for earth and star. The savage, dwelling in his cave, subsisting on roots and reptiles, or on beasts that could be slain with club and stone, surrounded by countless objects of terror, standing by rivers, so far as he knew, without source or end, by seas with but one shore, the prey of beasts mightier than himself, of diseases strange and fierce, trembling at the voice of thunder, blinded by the lightning, feeling the earth shake beneath him, seeing the sky lurid with the volcano's glare,—fell prostrate and begged for the protection of the Unknown.

In the long night of savagery, in the midst of pestilence and famine, through the long and dreary winters, crouched in dens of darkness, the seeds of superstition were sown in the brain of man. The savage believed, and thoroughly believed, that everything happened in reference to him; that he by his actions could excite the anger, or by his worship placate the wrath, of the Unseen. He resorted to flattery and prayer. To the best of his ability he put in stone, or rudely carved in wood, his idea of this god. For this idol he built a hut, a hovel, and at last a cathedral. Before these images he bowed, and at these shrines, whereon he lavished his wealth, he sought protection for himself and for the ones he loved. The few took advantage of the ignorant many. They pretended to have received messages from the Unknown. They stood between the helpless multitude and the gods. They were the carriers of flags of truce. At the court of heaven they presented the cause of man, and upon the labor of the deceived they lived.

The Christian of to-day wonders at the savage who bowed before his idol; and yet it must be confessed that the god of stone answered prayer and protected his worshippers precisely as the Christian's God answers prayer and protects his worshippers to-day.

My mind is so that it is forced to the conclusion that substance is eternal; that the universe was without beginning and will be without end; that it is the one eternal existence; that relations are transient and evanescent; that organisms are produced and vanish; that forms change,—but that the substance of things is from eternity to eternity. It may be that planets are born and

die, that constellations will fade from the infinite spaces, that countless suns will be quenched,—but the substance will remain.

The questions of origin and destiny seem to be beyond the powers of the human mind.

Heredity is on the side of superstition. All our ignorance pleads for the old. In most men there is a feeling that their ancestors were exceedingly good and brave and wise, and that in all things pertaining to religion their conclusions should be followed. They believe that their fathers and mothers were of the best, and that that which satisfied them should satisfy their children. With a feeling of reverence they say that the religion of their mother is good enough and pure enough and reasonable enough for them. In this way the love of parents and the reverence for ancestors have unconsciously bribed the reason and put out, or rendered exceedingly dim, the eyes of the mind.

There is a kind of longing in the heart of the old to live and die where their parents lived and died—a tendency to go back to the homes of their youth. Around the old oak of manhood grow and cling these vines. Yet it will hardly do to say that the religion of my mother is good enough for me, any more than to say the geology, or the astronomy, or the philosophy of my mother is good enough for me. Every human being is entitled to the best he can obtain; and if there has been the slightest improvement on the religion of the mother, the son is entitled to that improvement, and he should not deprive himself of that advantage by the mistaken idea that he owes it to his mother to perpetuate, in a reverential way, her ignorant mistakes.

If we are to follow the religion of our fathers and mothers, our fathers and mothers should have followed the religion of theirs. Had this been done, there could have been no improvement in the world of thought. The first religion would have been the last, and the child would have died as ignorant as the mother. Progress would have been impossible, and on the graves of ancestors would have been sacrificed the intelligence of mankind.

We know, too, that there has been the religion of the tribe, of the community, and of the nation, and that there has been a feeling that it was the duty of every member of the tribe or community, and of every citizen of the nation, to insist upon it that the religion of that tribe, of that community, of that nation, was better than that of any other. We know that all the prejudices

against other religions, and all the egotism of nation and tribe, were in favor of the local superstition. Each citizen was patriotic enough to denounce the religions of other nations and to stand firmly by his own. And there is this peculiarity about man: he can see the absurdities of other religions while blinded to those of his own. The Christian can see clearly enough that Mohammed was an imposter. He is sure of it, because the people of Mecca who were acquainted with him declared that he was no prophet; and this declaration is received by Christians as a demonstration that Mohammed was not inspired. Yet these same Christians admit that the people of Jerusalem who were acquainted with Christ rejected him; and this rejection they take as proof positive that Christ was the Son of God.

The average man adopts the religion of his country, or, rather, the religion of his country adopts him. He is dominated by the egotism of race, the arrogance of nation, and the prejudice called patriotism. He does not reason—he feels. He does not investigate—he believes. To him the religions of other nations are absurd and infamous, and their gods monsters of ignorance and cruelty. In every country this average man is taught, first, that there is a supreme being; second, that he has made known his will; third, that he will reward the true believer; fourth, that he will punish the unbeliever, the scoffer, and the blasphemer; fifth, that certain ceremonies are pleasing to this god; sixth, that he has established a church; and seventh, that priests are his representatives on earth. And the average man has no difficulty in determining that the god of his nation is the true God; that the will of this true God is contained in the sacred scriptures of his nation; that he is one of the true believers, and that the people of other nations—that is, believing other religions—are scoffers; that the only true church is the one to which he belongs; and that the priests of his country are the only ones who have had or ever will have the slightest influence with this true God. All these absurdities to the average man seem self-evident propositions; and so he holds all other creeds in scorn, and congratulates himself that he is a favorite of the one true God.

If the average Christian had been born in Turkey, he would have been a Mohammedan; and if the average Mohammedan had been born in New England and educated at Andover, he would have regarded the damnation of the heathen as the "tidings of great joy."

Nations have eccentricities, peculiarities, and hallucinations, and these find expression in their laws, customs, ceremonies, morals, and religions. And these are in great part determined by soil, climate, and the countless circumstances that mould and dominate the lives and habits of insects, individuals, and nations. The average man believes implicitly in the religion of his country, because he knows nothing of any other and has no desire to know. It fits him because he has been deformed to fit it, and he regards this fact of fit as an evidence of its inspired truth.

Has a man the right to examine, to investigate, the religion of his own country—the religion of his father and mother? Christians admit that the citizens of all countries not Christian have not only this right, but that it is their solemn duty. Thousands of missionaries are sent to heathen countries to persuade the believers in other religions not only to examine their superstitions, but to renounce them, and to adopt those of the missionaries. It is the duty of a heathen to disregard the religion of his country and to hold in contempt the creed of his father and of his mother. If the citizens of heathen nations have the right to examine the foundations of their religion, it would seem that the citizens of Christian nations have the same right. Christians, however, go further than this; they say to the heathen: You must examine your religion, and not only so, but you must reject it; and, unless you do reject it, and, in addition to such rejection, adopt ours, you will be eternally damned. Then these same Christians say to the inhabitants of a Christian country: You must not examine; you must not investigate; but whether you examine or not, you must believe, or you will be eternally damned.

If there be one true religion, how is it possible to ascertain which of all the religions the true one is? There is but one way. We must impartially examine the claims of all. The right to examine involves the necessity to accept or reject. Understand me, not the right to accept or reject, but the necessity. From this conclusion there is no possible escape. If, then, we have the right to examine, we have the right to tell the conclusion reached. Christians have examined other religions somewhat, and they have expressed their opinion with the utmost freedom—that is to say, they have denounced them all as false and fraudulent; have called their gods idols and myths, and their priests impostors.

The Christian does not deem it worth while to read the Koran.

Probably not one Christian in a thousand ever saw a copy of that book. And yet all Christians are perfectly satisfied that the Koran is the work of an impostor. No Presbyterian thinks it is worth his while to examine the religious systems of India; he knows that the Brahmins are mistaken, and that all their miracles are falsehoods. No Methodist cares to read the life of Buddha, and no Baptist will waste his time studying the ethics of Confucius. Christians of every sort and kind take it for granted that there is only one true religion, and that all except Christianity are absolutely without foundation. The Christian world believes that all the prayers of India are unanswered; that all the sacrifices upon the countless altars of Egypt, of Greece, and of Rome were without effect. They believe that all these mighty nations worshipped their gods in vain; that their priests were deceivers or deceived; that their ceremonies were wicked or meaningless; that their temples were built by ignorance and fraud, and that no God heard their songs of praise, their cries of despair, their words of thankfulness; that on account of their religion no pestilence was stayed; that the earthquake and volcano, the flood and storm went on their ways of death—while the real God looked on and laughed at their calamities and mocked at their fears.

We find now that the prosperity of nations has depended, not upon their religion, not upon the goodness or providence of some god, but on soil and climate and commerce, upon the ingenuity, industry, and courage of the people, upon the development of the mind, on the spread of education, on the liberty of thought and action; and that in this mighty panorama of national life, reason has built and superstition has destroyed.

Being satisfied that all believe precisely as they must, and that religions have been naturally produced, I have neither praise nor blame for any man. Good men have had bad creeds, and bad men have had good ones. Some of the noblest of the human race have fought and died for the wrong. The brain of man has been the trysting-place of contradictions. Passion often masters reason, and "the state of man, like to a little kingdom, suffers then the nature of an insurrection."

In the discussion of theological or religious questions, we have almost passed the personal phase, and we are now weighing arguments instead of exchanging epithets and curses. They who really seek for truth must be the best of friends. Each knows that his

desire can never take the place of fact, and that, next to finding truth, the greatest honor must be won in honest search.

We see that many ships are driven in many ways by the same wind. So men, reading the same book, write many creeds and lay out many roads to heaven. To the best of my ability, I have examined the religions of many countries and the creeds of many sects. They are much alike, and the testimony by which they are substantiated is of such a character that to those who believe is promised an eternal reward. In all the sacred books there are some truths, some rays of light, some words of love and hope. The face of savagery is sometimes softened by a smile—the human triumphs, and the heart breaks into song. But in these books are also found the words of fear and hate, and from their pages crawl serpents that coil and hiss in all the paths of men.

For my part, I prefer the books that inspiration has not claimed. Such is the nature of my brain that Shakespeare gives me greater joy than all the prophets of the ancient world. There are thoughts that satisfy the hunger of the mind. I am convinced that Humboldt knew more of geology than the author of Genesis; that Darwin was a greater naturalist than he who told the story of the flood; that Laplace was better acquainted with the habits of the sun and moon than Joshua could have been, and that Haeckel, Huxley, and Tyndall know more about the earth and stars, about the history of man, the philosophy of life—more that is of use, ten thousand times—than all the writers of the sacred books.

I believe in the religion of reason—the gospel of this world; in the development of the mind, in the accumulation of intellectual wealth, to the end that man may free himself from superstitious fear, to the end that he may take advantage of the forces of nature to feed and clothe the world.

Let us be honest with ourselves. In the presence of countless mysteries; standing beneath the boundless heaven sown thick with constellations; knowing that each grain of sand, each leaf, each blade of grass, asks of every mind the answerless question; knowing that the simplest thing defies solution; feeling that we deal with the superficial and the relative, and that we are forever eluded by the real, the absolute,—let us admit the limitations of our minds, and let us have the courage and the candor to say: We do not know. ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

THE NEW METHOD OF VOTING.

BY

THE HON. CHARLES T. SAXTON, NEW YORK STATE SENATOR-ELECT,
THE GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS,
THE GOVERNOR OF CONNECTICUT,
GEN. WILLIAM MAHONE, OF VIRGINIA.

The growing interest in ballot reform has induced us to invite Senator-elect Saxton, the originator of the Saxton Bill, to explain the form and purposes of that measure, and to point out wherein it differs from the laws that went into operation at the recent elections in Massachusetts and Connecticut. The Governors of those States have also been kind enough to indicate, for the benefit of the readers of THE REVIEW, the extent to which the recent elections have cast light upon the working of the new laws. The necessity of reform of some nature is forcibly suggested by General Mahone's contribution, which illustrates the doubts so often entertained by adherents of all parties as to the officially-declared results of elections conducted under the old methods. EDITOR N. A. R.

SENATOR-ELECT SAXTON:

I AM requested by the present editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW to state wherein the New York ballot measure vetoed last spring differs from the secret-ballot acts recently passed in Connecticut and Massachusetts. It is with pleasure that I accede to this request, because I recall the great interest that Mr. Thorndike Rice, the late distinguished editor of THE REVIEW, manifested in the subject. Indeed, my first inspiration in this line was drawn from his efforts in this direction and the draft of a bill made by him and published in the New York papers two or three years ago.

The brief space at my disposal will only permit me to answer the question in the most general way. The prominent features

of the New York bill were (1) that all ballots should be printed at public expense and delivered to voters by duly qualified officers; (2) that they should contain the names of all candidates nominated for a particular office; (3) that the voter should be entirely shielded from observation while preparing his ballot.

The Connecticut statute permits parties to print their own ballots upon official blanks furnished by the Secretary of State. The ballots are to be uniform in appearance. Any person may receive as many of these official blanks as he wishes upon payment of their actual cost. The Secretary of State must also deliver to the various town clerks, for the use of electors, envelopes of a certain size stamped with the seal of the State. At the entrance to each polling-place are an "envelope booth" and "a ballot booth, at which the voter may obtain ballots of any political party that he may desire"; each in charge of two persons not of the same political party, "who shall be appointed by the registrars." Adjoining the room where the ballot-box is placed are booths where the voter may enclose his ballot in the envelope "secure from outside observation." From the examination I have given this act itself, I infer that its practical operation is about as follows: The voter receives his party ballots in the presence of the two persons having charge of the ballot booth. At the envelope booth an official envelope is given to him, indorsed by the two persons designated for that purpose. He then goes into a private room, if he chooses, and encloses his ballot in the envelope, which he securely seals. Then passing into the pooling-place, where only the election officers and challengers are permitted to remain, he hands the envelope to the box-tender, who deposits it in the ballot-box.

The Connecticut law is doubtless good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. A party ballot cannot be a secret ballot. One of the cardinal principles of ballot reform is that no ballot should be allowed to go outside the polling-place and that no ballot should be valid that comes from the outside. The provision that places partisans in charge of the ballot booth gives poll-workers the opportunity they seek of ascertaining what party ballot the voter selects.

The Massachusetts law is essentially the same as the New York bill, although differing from it in many details. They contain substantially the same provisions for making and certifying nomi-

nations. Each prohibits the use of any but an official ballot, and requires the voter to prepare his ticket in a private booth. They differ mainly in their provisions as to the form of the ballots and the method of getting them into the hands of the election officers.

The Massachusetts law prescribes that there shall be but one ballot, which shall contain the names of all candidates for any office whose nominations have been duly made. These names shall be arranged in alphabetical order under the designation of the proper office, except that the names of candidates for Presidential elector shall be arranged in groups. "There shall also be added to all the names of candidates their party or political designation." All ballots, except those for use in city elections, are to be prepared by the Secretary of the Commonwealth. He is required to send two sets of them in sealed packages, "at different times and by different methods," to each town clerk, a certain number of hours before the day of election. One set is for distribution to the different polling-places in the town. The second set is sent as a precautionary measure, and is only to be used in case of necessity.

The New York bill, instead of the "blanket" ballot, required separate ballots for the different classes of officers. In other words, the various ballots indorsed "State," "County," etc., provided for by existing laws, were to be retained. The names of all nominees for the same office were to be placed upon one ballot, but grouped together under party names, so that the elector might vote for an entire group by making the proper mark opposite the party name at the head of such group. The ballots were to be printed by the county clerks, instead of the Secretary of State, and delivered by them to the election officers on the morning of election day. There was no provision for printing more than one set of ballots, but in case the ballots should not be delivered, for any reason, *fac-simile* unofficial ballots might be used.

These are the main points of difference between the two measures. While they call for careful consideration, they do not touch any vital question. The principles underlying them are identical.

CHARLES T. SAXTON.

THE GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS:

BY THE election of the 5th of November in this Commonwealth a full and fair test of the so-called "Australian ballot" was effected. Enacted by the Legislature of 1888, the law which

gave to this system of voting form and life did not take effect until the present year, and the interval was improved by study of the measure, which made its provisions familiar to all who take an active interest in elections, while the most indifferent could not escape some knowledge of its provisions, so thorough has been the discussion in the press and from many platforms.

The first of the advantages of the measure to be brought out conspicuously was that the nominations were made at least fourteen days before the date of the election. This produced two desirable results : that the character and fitness of the candidates could be considered with care, and that those who were nominated, either by caucuses or conventions or by papers filed by their friends, could withdraw from the candidacy in which they had been placed, without prejudicing themselves or others by what might have been considered hasty action.

More important, however, was the provision by the Commonwealth of all the ballots. Here was struck a severe blow at corruption in politics. When the printing of ballots was in the hands of the party committees, it was possible that grave injustice might be done by the accidental or intentional omission of the name of a candidate ; and it was also possible that candidates might be assessed to an altogether unreasonable amount, if the intimation were given or the threat made that, unless such assessment were paid, their names would not appear on the ballots. In other words, by this provision one of the most powerful of the weapons of the professional politician was taken from him.

This providing by the Commonwealth of all the ballots used is one of the most important means by which secrecy in voting is secured. As all the names of all the nominees to be voted for were placed on the same sheet of paper, there were no means of so marking the ballots that any one could tell to which candidates a voter gave preference.

The distribution of these ballots at every polling-place by those specially appointed to do that work is another excellent feature of this system of voting. This change made the polling-places differ greatly from what they have been. Hitherto the approaches to them, and their entrances, have been frequented by vote-distributors, acting in the interests of the various parties and candidates, and their importunities and rudeness caused serious annoyance to those to whom good manners are of importance. At the late

election this nuisance was entirely abated. The "striker" and the "heeler" could not have been pleased with the change, but the average citizen found that it removed a grievance of long standing, the weight of which he had never before fully realized.

In the actual voting there was no difficulty. The ballots were so made up, and so much had been written and said about them, that every one was prepared, on arriving at the polling-places, to mark his ballot as he saw fit, and to do this speedily. In places where more than three hundred were to vote at one poll, counting was slow; but where the number of voters was three hundred or less, the returns were made with surprising rapidity and, as recounts have already shown, with remarkable accuracy.

This election has been the best test of the "reading and writing" qualification of the State constitution that has ever been had. That a man might vote intelligently he was obliged to use both knowledge and judgment; and the results achieved show that the voters of this Commonwealth are fully as well informed as they have been credited with being.

No one would seriously consider the repeal of this election law, and a consequent return to the old election methods. Men of all shades of political opinion agree that the measure has worked well, and that it is a permanent part of the statutes of Massachusetts. In its details some changes may be deemed necessary, but in its main principles it is beyond adverse criticism. It secures absolute freedom from party dictation; it gives opportunity for wise and careful choice; it makes every voter directly responsible to himself for his individual action. To inaugurate the working of this statute has cost a large sum of money, but the results achieved are well worth all that has been expended.

OLIVER AMES.

THE GOVERNOR OF CONNECTICUT:

THE chief points of our law are *secrecy*, secured by the booth-system, in which ballots can be arranged by the individual voter; the prohibition of *ticket-peddling* within one hundred feet of the polling-place; and the use of *official paper* upon which tickets shall be printed, of the size and in type prescribed by the Secretary of State; also the use of an *official envelope* furnished by the State, in which the ballots cast must be placed, and the envelope sealed before being deposited in the ballot-box.

The law is as simple as it could well be and yet prove at all

effective to accomplish its purpose. Under its provisions every voter can cast an absolutely secret ballot, if he so desires; yet I do not regard our experience in this State at our local elections held in October as sufficient to justify any expression of opinion as to the merits of the law under which it was conducted. The vote was only about one-half the registered vote of the State, and the election was for town officials only. Our plan of minority representation in vogue for many years, and the disposition of our people to retain tried officials in their places, prevent generally any contest. Until we test the law in a general State election, it would be premature to form a definite conclusion as to its working.

MORGAN G. BULKELEY.

GENERAL MAHONE:

UNTIL further details have been gathered in from all the precincts of the State, it will be impossible to give a full idea of the frauds and outrages that have been perpetrated during the recent election in Virginia. The Democratic managers, having discovered that their canvass at the very start fell flat, and that the masses of their voters could not be aroused to take part in their campaign, while everywhere the Republicans were hopeful and in dead earnest, and further discovering that large numbers of Democrats were coming over to us, reached the conclusion that they were badly beaten, and that only the most fraudulent employment of the election machinery, which they controlled at every precinct, could save them. Thereupon they placed their whole reliance on this for defeating the popular will. So it was expected that they would go to excesses; and never in the history of the State has fraud run riot more unblushingly over the sacred right of suffrage. Counties that gave our late Presidential ticket 1,700 majority have been, by open and violent fraud, made to give 500 Democratic majority now. The presence of Federal supervisors in the Presidential election gave us measureable protection at that time. In this State election, however, there was and could be no remedy. All the while Democratic voters made public boasts that, no matter how many votes the Republicans secured, the Democrats had the machinery and would count them out. Their officers gave direction to this plan of campaign from the first, and fraud was the only agency employed throughout the campaign. Nowhere did their candidates pretend to discuss issues.

As a specimen of the frauds perpetrated the following table may not be uninteresting :

THE VOTE OF NORFOLK COUNTY, NOVEMBER 5, 1889, AS SHOWN BY THE TALLY-SHEETS KEPT AT EACH POLLING-PLACE, NOT INCLUDING ANY DOUBTFUL VOTES :

Name of Precinct.	*Republican.*	*Democratic.*	*Name of Precinct.*	*Republican.*	*Democratic.*
Indian Creek	118	83	Hall's Corner	239	102
Hickory Grove	90	108	Churchland	260	92
Bell's Mill	48	122	Bowen Hill	176	59
Bethel	284	212	Deep Creek	266	108
Oak Grove	83	79	East Berkley	523	31
West Berkley	204	373	Glebe	374	80
Huntersville	421	61			
Zion's Church	166	175	Total	3,486	1,785
Cross Roads	270	100			

Republican majority polled	1,701
Republican voters in line when polls closed at Glebe	250
Republican voters in line when polls closed at Hall's Corner	160
Republicans refused votes on transfer at East Berkley	110
Republicans offering to vote at West Berkley whose names were stricken from book	30
Republican majority proper	2,251
NOTE.—Republican majority proper	2,251
Democratic majority returned	496
Number of votes stolen by Democrats	2,747

Here, as elsewhere, and everywhere in every county and city of the State, the Democratic managers had absolute control of the polls, and here, as elsewhere, the election judges were appointed the night before election day, while the law provides that they shall be appointed in March. Those who may have been appointed then and could not be induced to engage in the general scheme of robbery planned and prescribed by the Democratic managers were compelled by one means and another to give way for those who would. By this report, every statement of which can be sustained by the voters themselves, it appears that the Republican ticket was cheated out of 2,747 votes at the polls, not counting those who had been disfranchised on Saturday, October 26, by the unlawful process of the Democratic managers in "purging the polls," as they say.

This return from one county shows that, whereas the Republican ticket was entitled to a majority of 2,251, the Democratic managers gave the county to the Democratic ticket by a fraudulent majority of 496.

As yet we have heard of but two counties where the like methods were not applied, and in these two counties our Republican majorities were increased.

WILLIAM MAHONE.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

THE AMERICAN CONSULAR SERVICE.

IT IS surprising that, with all that has been said, argued, and attempted to be done to reform our civil service during the past ten years, so little attention has been paid by orators and legislators to the need of reforming the consular system. For if there is any branch of the public service to which the ordinarily-accepted maxims of civil-service reform should apply, which needs a thorough overhauling and readjustment on a business basis, it is that branch to which the commercial interests and the individual rights of American citizenship abroad are committed. A recent writer has perhaps gone too far in saying that "the consular service is of very little benefit to the country"; but it is true that its practical reform would very greatly enlarge its benefit. Why the consular system has not been placed within the scope of the civil-service rules already established, it is difficult for any one who has any knowledge of the defects of that system—defects serious and of long continuance—to comprehend.

To our consuls abroad are committed two principal and essentially distinct tasks, according to the locality of the consulates. The principal duty of a consul at a seaport is to see that the laws relating to the American ships and crews arriving at or departing from that port are carried out; to protect the masters in their relations with the port authorities, and to protect the crews both against the masters and as temporary sojourners in a foreign land. The principal duty of a consul at an inland manufacturing or exporting town is to examine and certify to the truth of the invoices of goods exported thence to the United States. Other duties of consuls in both kinds of consulates are to protect the rights of individual American citizens when they are threatened in the locality; to make reports to the home government on the commercial condition of the consular district; and to represent the nation officially on public occasions. The gravity of these duties varies, of course, according to the importance, in its relations to the United States, of the locality; and it may be added parenthetically here that one defect of our consular system is that the salaries of consuls are very unequal, and are by no means scaled according to the relative importance and responsibilities of the consulships.

There is, moreover, another function of consuls, which is not enjoined by any law, which, indeed, it would not be easy to define in strict legal phrase, and which to some minds may present a somewhat sentimental aspect; but which, when we consider how vigorous a force sentiment has always been in influencing human affairs, should be regarded as far from unimportant. This is the duty the consul should fulfil of representing, in his person, bearing, and attainments, American enlightenment, intelligence, and refinement in the presence of a foreign community. Such a community will necessarily make large inferences as to the social condition of the country by observing its official representative. The consul, especially in a provincial city or town, is a not inconspicuous person. He dines with the mayor and other officials; he is usually invited into the best society; a place of honor is assigned him on public occasions. It is not difficult to see that his personal influence, as a result of his personal character and bearing, will be a factor in the efficient exercise of his official duties, and still less so to perceive that his personal and social qualities will have much to do with the judgment which the community will form of the mass of his countrymen.

What, then, should be the qualifications of our consuls, in order that this service should become, not a doubtful, but a large and substantial, benefit to the nation? It would seem that those qualifications should not only be readily guessed, but that they should be recognized and strictly required by the general government. That an official upon whom the duties which have been outlined are to devolve should be a man of good general education; that he should have a good knowledge of, and the power to use readily and correctly, the English language; that, if serving in Continental Europe, he should be conversant both with French and with the tongue of the country in which he is to reside; that he should have the laws regulating the consular service at his fingers' ends, and be well informed in United States commercial law, and have some familiarity, at least, with international law, would seem to be propositions above the region of dispute. And none the less clear would it seem to be that these qualifications, one and all, should be subjected to a searching examination, in accordance with the principle of civil-service reform.

But there is one important duty imposed upon consuls posted at inland importing towns, the ability to perform which cannot, perhaps, be readily ascertained by an examination made previous to its assumption. The vexed question of the undervaluation of invoices has fitfully made its appearance in public discussion during the past few years. It is a question of undoubted importance, since fraud in the importation of goods from abroad attacks both the revenues of the state and the business interests of honest merchants. There is no space here to discuss the subject of undervaluations in a large sense; but that subject nearly concerns that of the efficiency of consuls. Under our revenue system, two detectives are set upon the importations of goods into the country to see to it that these importations are in character and price what the invoices which describe them represent them to be. One of these detectives is the consul resident at the point of manufacture or export; the other is the home custom-house. Goods which are undervalued by invoice must pass both these portals in order to enter into unfair competition with honestly-invoiced goods; and if they do so pass, it is by reason of the ignorance and inefficiency of the official guardians of our commercial interests. Now it is the duty of the consul—a duty which, there can be no doubt, many consuls, under our present system, ignore and neglect—to become an expert in the goods exported to the United States from his district; to require, as he has a right to do, samples of every article described in every invoice presented to him for certification; to submit such samples, in cases of narrow margins of price and cases in which he is in doubt, to competent judges of the goods on the spot; and in case of the detection of an undervaluation, to report it promptly to the home government, and thus secure a just confiscation of goods.

Lastly, an American consul should be an American gentlemen. He should have good manners and a good address, tact, courtesy, good habits, both of business and of personal conduct, social as well as business ability. He need not in the least abate his patriotic belief in or affection for the democratic institutions and society of his own country; nor should he, on the other hand, go out of his way to manifest contempt of the different institutions of the country where he finds himself posted.

At present, as in the past, it cannot be said that consuls are selected by our government with sole or, in very many instances, with prevailing reference to their fitness to fill their offices efficiently. A consulship amid the historic monuments, the artistic splendors, and the natural beauties of the Old World, seems an enchanting prospect, not only to the hack political worker, but to the scholar and man-of-letters. No office is more eagerly sought for; and, it is not pleasant to add, no office is more frequently bestowed, without a thought as to qualifications, as a reward of personal friendship, or of political service, or as an easy method of getting rid of an importunate relative. A consul thus appointed, and indifferent to his duties, may, no doubt, spend an easy and pleasant four or eight years in Europe. A conscientious and efficient consul, on the other hand, will find his duties grave, and will accept and respond to serious responsibilities.

To make the consular service really efficient and valuable to the country, then, it should be placed within the scope of the civil-service rules. An examination

should prove the candidate to be generally intelligent, endowed with business capacities, skilful and correct in his English, possessing a good knowledge of French and the language of the country of his residence, and endowed with a good character, good habits, and good manners. Efficient service in the consulate should insure not only retention in office, but promotion in due course. This would remove from the consul not only the feeling that it was not worth while to attend to his duties, since his removal was probable at the end of his term, but the temptation to "make the most" of his tenure so long as it existed.

There is only one more feature of the service apparently capable of improvement, which can just be touched upon. The consuls in Europe are, at the best, three thousand miles from their responsible chief. Would it not be well to create a superior officer nearer at hand? Would not the service be improved if the consul-general at the chief centre of a country—say at London or Paris—should be made the responsible chief of the consuls resident in that country, keeping watch over them, giving them instructions when necessary, and consulting with them as occasion demanded?

GEORGE MAKEPEACE TOWLE.

II.

A LEGISLATIVE KINDERGARTEN.

THIS great land of ours abounds in all sorts of educational institutions. In one cooking is taught, and the graduates on exhibition offer doughnuts and croquettes, instead of essays and disquisitions. Others take a grist of raw boys and run them through the hopper of applied journalism. Others, again, teach political economy according to the American plan, which abhors reason and theory. Telegraphy, type-writing, plumbing—but I am not Walt Whitman and I fear my catalogue would be as dull as the second book of the "Iliad." Besides, I do not wish now to be eulogistic, but suggestive, and to point out a lack. There is one great lack that, it is surprising to me, has as yet never suggested itself to the enlightened minds of our Republic. And that is a legislative kindergarten.

It is a perpetual surprise to most people that Congress each year accomplishes so little and wastes so much. There is a gathering of men chosen presumably for superior merit or talent or experience. Most towns are rather proud that Senator So-and-so or Mr. Blank, M. C., lives within their limits. We may indulge in sarcasm, but we are glad to see "my friend the Senator." Each man in Congress may be considered to be in some way above the average. Why on earth, then, is the aggregate of these great men so disappointing? It is a curious phenomenon: a session of Congress is a disorderly bedlam, a seat of idiotic gambols, a pathetic ambuscade of incompetency, a bear-pit of rascality, where all that should be done is neglected and everything unworthy is perpetrated. Not one single man out of that assembly would ever think of doing such foolish things as they all do when put together. It is almost incomprehensible; but the explanation is utterly simple—so simple, in fact, that so far as I know it has never been pointed out.

It is this: each new legislature is an infant, and as irresponsible as an infant. You do not expect staid gravity from a yearling. What is an infant? His little body, so apparently fresh and new, is made up of constituents that are as old as the hills. Star-dust may make the circuit of his veins; the perished leviathan that swallowed Jonah may, by only a few metamorphoses, be built into his bones; Solomon's very brain may be represented in his occiput. He is the resultant of a million intellects—who knows? His spirit may be the spirit reborn of one who but a twelvemonth back, was expecting obedience and most loath to render it. Then, again, so far as we know, thousands of living organisms swarm through his frame, as conscious of their own happiness, and as unconscious of his, as devoted to their own affairs, as long-lived in proportion, as any man. Yet that infant, bristling with all ages, full of all wisdoms, containing a macrocosm, kicks up its heels, crows, creeps into the fire, carries his spoon to the ear instead of the mouth, is toothless, helpless, vacuous, cruel, everything bad and everything good, the darling of our hearts, and the last person to look to for practical wisdom!

So the legislature, made up of separate Solons, becomes a new entity, as hope

less, as helpless, as pitiable as a new-born babe. It sprawls, it clutches at the moon it indulges in senseless cries, it has the colic, it crawls for any bright light that attracts it. Thus it often falls into the fire. And the greater entity, the country, the mother of it, she who brought it forth in travail, looks on and endures its imperious moods and forgives its impudent mewling. Doubtless the spark of Plato that is imbedded in my brain protests loudly at my folly, and so throughout the land men grumble at Congress and wish they were there to be wiser. But the wisest would be just as foolish in the foolish whole.

But in the case of the child, as soon as he gets out of his swaddling-clothes he is sent to a kindergarten, which is an institution for organized laziness. He is, at least, kept out of mischief, and his spirit of destructiveness and waste is turned into harmless channels. I would propose, therefore, to have a kindergarten for legislatures, It could be arranged this way: the first year, or possibly the first two years, of its corporate existence should be merely experimental. It might pass as many laws as it cared to spend the time on, but none of them should take effect. Meantime the legislature last elected would have been somewhat schooled and have come out of that foolish stage, and might be entrusted with some genuine functions. The details of this kindergarten can be easily worked out; but the suggestion I offer with no mistrust that there will be seen in it any insidious plea for a revolution in our government or a suggestion for a tenure of office dependent on something as fickle as the "popular will."

N. H. DOLE.

III.

HOW TO SUPPRESS QUACKERY.

Dr. AUSTIN FLINT, in the October issue of THE REVIEW, outlines a plan which, he thinks, if adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York, would also be adopted by all the other States in the Union, and do much towards closing the door of quackery in the medical profession, which now stands so wide open. Many of the provisions of the proposed act are very excellent, but the opening article would, I think, prevent the regents of the State University from giving the plan a moment's consideration. The article reads as follows:

"I. The regents of the University of the State of New York to appoint a board of medical examiners, to consist of fourteen members, seven to be nominated by the unsectarian medical colleges empowered to confer the degree of M.D. in the State of New York, and to be teachers in said colleges, and seven to be nominated by the unsectarian State medical societies; the board to be so constituted that there shall be two examiners for each of the seven subjects of practice of medicine, surgery, obstetrics, materia medica and therapeutics, physiology, anatomy, chemistry and the collateral branches."

I do not believe the State will ever lower the dignity of its University or insult its officers by permitting any medical school or society to dictate to them in the appointment of their committees. The same power which made the State University can unmake it, and its officers will be pretty careful how they violate in their work the strict principles of justice to all.

In the discussion of the question of a "State board of medical examiners" before the Senate committee last winter, I was present by special invitation. I stated that I believed an arrangement could be made by which the license to practise medicine by a board of examiners of one State would be good in every State when the provisions of their boards of examiners were the same. I argued that the board of examiners of this State should be appointed by the regents of the State University, of which the medical schools form a part; the examinations to be written in answer to questions selected by the regents from those sent them by the examiners; the name of the student and the college from which he graduated being in no case communicated to the examiners. I recommended also that there should be no examiner in therapeutics, but the student, having mastered the groundwork of his profession and familiarized himself with the physiological action of remedial agents, should be left to his own judgment in their application. As the examination papers would be deposited in the archives of the University for future reference in case of supposed injustice, there could be no possible chance of favoritism, and all the colleges would stand or fall solely on

their own merits. These suggestions were cordially indorsed by the representives of the old school as being, in their estimation, a just and practical solution of the whole question, and undeniably not only in the interest of the public, whose servants we all claim to be, but also of every educated member of the profession.

EGBERT GUERNSEY, M. D.

IV.

A CHANCE FOR MILLIONAIRES.

THE opportunity awaits the man. In New York city to-day there is the chance for one or more persons of great wealth to make for themselves name and fame undying; to win the gratitude, respect, and admiration, not only of the United States, but of all America, of the whole civilized world; a chance to make their memory revered as long as the government shall last. And all this with little effort, as far as the millionaires are personally concerned.

There are men possessed of noble ideas and generous spirits who are anxiously searching for a way to benefit mankind through a proper disposition of their property. To them is this article addressed. It is written to suggest a plan for founding an institution which would be more far-reaching than any college, which would accomplish untold good, which would make evil-doers of whatever station tremble, which would aid struggling humanity to better its condition; an institution more powerful than pulpit, stage, or forum,—an absolutely truthful, unprejudiced, independent, daily paper, whose news columns shall tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and whose editorials shall discuss both sides of every important question.

The vast power of American journalism cannot be denied, even fettered as it is on all sides. It accomplishes much good, but it also is responsible for much evil. Prejudiced, fearful, and often corrupt as is the press of to-day, it still remains the most influential factor in American civilization. In this respect all else sinks into insignificance beside it; and yet its bulwarks have been raised at an awful expense to good morals and good government.

Who is foolish enough to play the races on newspaper "tips"? Why does one journal suppress all but bare mention of a certain railroad accident, while another publishes a column account of the same? Why do papers cater respectively to the Irish, the German, the Italian vote? Why does one fight Catholicism, and a second war upon Protestants? Why do newspapers support party candidates, whether the latter are known to be honest men or the veriest scoundrels in the ward?

Every day an irresponsible reporter or correspondent hurls misery, shame, disgrace, upon some family for the sole purpose of lengthening his space bill. Within a month two suicides have been recorded whose causes are ascribed to the publication of certain articles. The men who took their own lives may not have been mentally sound; but is that any reason why homes should be invaded by unscrupulous ghouls of the press?

The journal of to-day is edited from the counting-room. The ideal newspaper has not yet made its appearance. The editorial and the business departments should be absolutely independent of each other. The paper should speak the truth, no matter how its advertising patronage or its political "pull" is affected.

A free and unsubsidized press—where will you find it? Papers all over the land will rise up, and each, patting itself, cry "Here!" But those in command know that the daily paper which prints the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, the daily paper whose editorial opinions are absolutely fearless and unprejudiced, does not exist in the United States.

The ideal paper should print in its news columns nothing but that which has been verified. Readers might not get particulars of a race war so soon as in one of the present "enterprising" journals; but when published in the ideal paper the news could be absolutely relied upon. The editorials should discuss in parallel columns both sides of leading questions. For example, articles advocating free trade and protection should appear simultaneously. In the case of a great strike, one column should contain the employer's views, another the laborer's arguments. Chicago should have the chance of putting forth her reasons for wanting the World's Fair as well as New York. The

Southern and the Northern sides of the race problem should both be discussed. The paper should argue for and against every great question, local, national, international. Then could the people read, reflect, and decide who and what is the right.

Would such an impartial journal pay? Perhaps not in money at first. But the people of the United States are willing to be convinced; they want the best government, the best officials, the best of everything. That paper in time would be read from Maine to California, and beyond the seas. Its influence would be inestimable, its power transcendent. Evil-doers of whatever party and station, rich or poor, black or white, alien or native, would fear it. Good citizens would eagerly support it. The poor would pray for its success.

The ideal paper should not be pledged to support any party, community, state, or government. It should be nothing less than the exponent of humanity. And it must occupy this grand plane if not an advertisement is received, if not a single copy is sold. How can this be accomplished? Here lies the millionaire's chance to see his name grouped with those who have made nations, who have conferred lasting benefits upon mankind.

Endow such a paper as colleges are endowed. Let it be managed by a board of trustees. Let the employees represent the faculty; the readers, the students. Pay salaries large enough to command the best editors, writers, and publishers. Have the trustees select for these various positions men of integrity, of broad minds, of education, ability, culture, and noble ideas. Be liberal, so that they will put forth continually their best efforts. Guarantee to the paper a regular income, that it may be published day after day and decade after decade, if the advertising columns are blank, if every copy has to be given away.

The time is ripe, the people are anxious, the field is unoccupied. A great daily paper which could be relied upon absolutely would be a monument forever to its founders.

Where is the man or the group of men who will improve this opportunity?

HENRY E. ROOD

INDEX

TO THE

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-NINTH VOLUME

OF THE

North American Review.

ABBOTT, LYMAN. A Word with Professor Huxley, 157.
Abolishing Poverty—On Paper, 124.
Actor, What Makes the? 379.
ADAMS, CHARLES K. Discipline in American Colleges, 15.
Advantages of Debt, The, 255.
Agnostic, Why am I an? 741.
Alaska, Our Ignorance of, 78.
Allen Thorndike Rice, Tributes to, 110, 247.
American Auguries, 120.
American Consular Service, The, 757.
American Fiction, Foreign Influence on, 118.
Americans, The Sense of Honor in, 205.
AMES, OLIVER. The New Method of Voting, 752.
An Emergency that Demands A Word, 384.
ANGELL, JAMES B. Discipline in American Colleges, 6.
Are Public Libraries Public Blessings? 339.
Are Telegraph Rates too High? 569.
Army, The German, with Personal Recollections—1848 to 1889, 182.
ASTOR, WILLIAM WALDORF. A Tribute to Allen Thorndike Rice, 110.
Audiences, Halls, and Theatres, 429.
Anguries, American, 120.
AUSTEN, PETER T. Our Struggle for Existence, 248.

BARTLETT, S. C. Discipline in American Colleges, 1.
BARTON, CLARA. Philanthropy at Johnstown, 142.
BEAVER, JAMES A. The Money Sent to Johnstown, 129.
BENJAMIN, S. G. W. Europe in Persian Eyes, 505.
BLIND, KARL. A Good Word for Jews, 673; The German Army, with Personal Recollections—1848 to 1889, 182.
Book Review, The Cash Value of a, 223.
Booth, J. Wilkes, The Slayer of, 382.
BOUCICAULT, DION. Leaves from a Dramatist's Diary, 228; Theatres, Halls, and Audiences, 429.
BRADLEY, JOSEPH P. The Question of Divorce, 644.
BROWN, HAROLD P. The New Instrument of Execution, 586.
BRYCE, LLOYD. A Tribute to Allen Thorndike Rice, 114.
BULKELEY, MORGAN G. The New Method of Voting, 754.
BUNCE, OLIVER B. The Cash Value of a Book Review, 223.
BURROUGHS, JOHN. The Corroboration of Prof. Huxley, 560.
BYRNES, THOMAS. Nurseries of Crime, 355.

CAMPBELL, N. A. Protection for our Language, 127.
Can the Mosquito be Exterminated? 363.
Capital Punishment by Electricity, 321.
CARDEN, G. L. Naval Education in the Future, 509.
CARNEGIE, ANDREW. The Best Fields for Philanthropy, 682.
CARPENTER, HENRY B. The Poetry of Poverty, 237.
Chance for Millionaires, A, 761.
Christianity, Will Reason Exterminate it? 196.
Churches, Taxation or Non-Taxation for, 636.
Cities, Rapid Transit in, 250.
Civil-Service Reform Again, 638.
Civil-Service Reform and Common-Sense, 265.
Civil War, An English View of the, 30, 164, 278, 446, 594, 713.
CLEWS, HENRY. Great Britain and the Confederacy, 215.
Coal Supply, Our, Will it Ever be Exhausted? 511.
Colleges, Discipline in American, 1.
Comedy, Modern, The Tendencies of, 607.
Common-Sense and Civil-Service Reform, 265.
Conceits, Our National, 550.
Conemaugh, The Lesson of, 150.
Confederacy, Great Britain and the, 215.
Congress, The Coming, 293.
Constitutional Patchwork, 253.
Consular Service, The American, 757.
COOKE, ROSE TERRY. The Real Rights of Women, 347.
CORBIN, AUSTIN. The Tyranny of Labor Organizations, 413.
Corroboration of Prof. Huxley, The, 560.
Crime, Nurseries of, 355.
CROFFUT, W. A. "Thought-Transference," 126.

CURTIS, WILLIAM ELEROY. Friends in South America, 377.
Customs, Some Early Harvard, 637.

DAMROSCH, WALTER. German Opera and Every-day Life, 699.
Dangers of Electric Lighting, The, 625.
DAVIS, HORACE. Discipline in American Colleges, 26.
DAVIS, JEFFERSON. Lord Wolseley's Mistakes, 472.
DAWSON, Sir J. W. Discipline in American Colleges, 22.
Debt, The Advantages of, 255.
Democratic Party, The Hopes of the, 539.
DICKINSON, DON M. Progress and the Post, 399.
DIKE, SAMUEL W. Is Divorce Wrong? 513.
Discipline in American Colleges, 1.
Divorce, Is it Wrong? 513.
Divorce, The Question of, 641.
DOLE, N. H. A Legislative Kindergarten, 759.
DOLPH, J. N. The Question of Divorce, 646.
DOREMUS, R. OGDEN. The Open Door of Quackery, 496.
DOYLE, JOHN T. Civil-Service Reform Again, 638.
Dramatist's Diary, Leaves from a, 228.

Edison, A Reply to Mr., 653.
EDISON, THOMAS A. The Dangers of Electric Lighting, 625.
EGGLESTON, WILLIAM G. The Open Door of Quackery, 483.
Electric Lighting, The Dangers of, 625.
Electricity, Capital Punishment by, 321.
Elixir of Life, The, 257.
ELY, RICHARD T. The Telegraph Monopoly, 44.
English, French Proper Names in, 128.
English Strikes, The Warning of the, 385.
English View of the Civil War, An, 30, 164, 278, 446, 594, 713.
Episcopalian, Why I Am an, 302.
Ericsson and his "Monitor," 460.
Europe in Persian Eyes, 505.
Every-Day Life and German Opera, 699.
Execution, The New Instrument of, 586.
Exhibitions, The Value of International, 312.
Existence, Our Struggle for, 248.

FARRAR, F. W. Why I Am an Episcopalian, 302.
Fiction, The Future of, 580.
FIELD, KATE. Our Ignorance of Alaska, 78.
Fields for Philanthropy, The Best, 682.
FLINT, AUSTIN. The Open Door of Quackery, 491.
Foreign Influence on American Fiction, 118.
French Proper Names in English, 128.
Friends in South America, 377.
FRY, JAMES B. Lord Wolseley Answered, 728.
Future of Fiction, The, 580.
Future of the newspaper, The, 122.

GEORGE HENRY. The Warning of the English Strikes, 385.
German Army, The, With Personal Recollections—1848 to 1889, 182.
German Opera and Every-day Life, 699.
GERRY, ELBRIDGE T. Capital Punishment by Electricity, 321.
GIBBONS, CARDINAL. Is Divorce Wrong? 517.
GLADSTONE, WILLIAM E. A Tribute to Allen Thorndike Rice, 247; The Question of Divorce, 641.
Great Britain and the Confederacy, 215.
GREEN, NORVIN. Are Telegraph Rates too High? 569.
GUERNSEY, EGBERT. How to Suppress Quackery, 760.

Halls, Theatres, and Audiences, 429.
HALSTEAD, MURAT. Our National Conceits, 550.
HAMMOND, WILLIAM A. The Elixir of Life, 257.
HARLAND, MARION. Ministers' Wives, 371; The Incapacity of Business Women, 707.
HARRISON, FREDERIC. The Transformation of Paris, 326.
Harvard Customs, Some Early, 637.
HAWLEY, JOSEPH R. The Value of International Exhibitions, 312.
HOAR, GEORGE F. Are the Republicans in to Stay? 616.
HOLCOMBE, JOHN M. The Money Value of a Human Life, 507.
HOOVER, R. B. The Slayer of J. Wilkes Booth, 382.
Hopes of the Democratic Party, The, 539.
HUBBARD, JAMES M. Are Public Libraries Public Blessings? 339.
Human Life, The Money Value of a, 507.
Huxley, Prof., A Word with, 157.
Huxley, Prof., The Corroboration of, 560.
HYDE, WILLIAM D. W. Discipline in American Colleges, 18.

If! 381.
Ignorance of Alaska, Our, 78.
Incapacity of Business Women, The, 707.
INGERSOLL, ROBERT G. Is Divorce Wrong? 529; Why Am I an Agnostic? 741.
Instrument of Execution, The New, 586.
Intellect, The Negro, 91.
International Exhibitions, The Value of, 312.

JACKSON, EDWARD P. Will Our Coal Supply Ever be Exhausted? 511.
Jews, A Good Word for, 673.
Johnstown, Philanthropy at, 142.
Johnstown, The Money Sent to, 129.

Kindergarten, A Legislative, 759.

Labor Organizations, The Tyranny of, 413.
Language, Protection for Our, 127.
Leaves from a Dramatist's Diary, 228.
Legislative Kindergarten, A, 759.
LODGE, HENRY CABOT. The Coming Congress, 293.
Lord Wolseley Answered, 728.
Lord Wolseley's Mistakes, 472.
LUCE, S. B. Our Future Navy, 54.

MACCORD, CHARLES W. Ericsson and his "Monitor," 460.
MAGNUS, JULIAN. What Makes the Actor? 379.
MAHONE, WILLIAM. The New Method of Voting, 755.

MATHEWS, WILLIAM. If! 381; The Advantages of Debt, 255; The Negro Intellect, 91.
McCARTHY, JUSTIN. The Throne in England, 66.
McCOOK, HENRY C. Can the Mosquito be Exterminated? 363.
MEREDITH, KINGDON. An Emergency that Demands a Word, 384.
Method of Voting, The New, 750.
Millionaires, A Chance for, 761.
MILLS, ROGER Q. Republican Tactics in the House, 665.
MILLS, W. W. The Union Men of the South, 635.
Ministers' Wives, 371.
Money Sent to Johnstown, The, 129.
Money Value of a Human Life, The, 507.
"Monitor," Ericsson and his, 460.
Monopoly, The Telegraph, 44.
Mosquito, Can it be Exterminated? 363.

National Conceits, Our, 550.
National House, Obstruction in the, 421.
Naval Education in the Future, 509.
Navy, Our Future, 54.
Negro Intellect, The, 91.
Newspaper, The Future of the, 122.
NORTH, HELEN MARSHALL. Some Early Harvard Customs, 637.
NOYES, CHARLES J. Constitutional Patchwork, 253.
Nurseries of Crime, 355.

Obstruction in the National House, 421.
Open Door of Quackery, The, 483.
OSWALD, FELIX L. American Auguries, 120.
Our Future Navy, 54.
Our Struggle for Existence, 248.

PALMER, ARCHIE EMERSON. Rapid Transit in Cities, 250.
Paris, The Transformation of, 326.
Patchwork, Constitutional, 253.
Persian Eyes, Europe in, 505.
Philanthropy at Johnstown, 142.
Philanthropy, The Best Fields for, 682.
PIERREPONT, EDWARDS. A Tribute to Allen Thorndike Rice, 112.
Poetry of Poverty, The, 237.
POPE, JOHN. Common-Sense and Civil-Service Reform, 265.
Post, Progress and the, 399.
POTTER, HENRY C. Is Divorce Wrong? 524.
Poverty, Abolishing—on Paper, 124.
Poverty, The Poetry of, 237.
POWELL, J. W. The Lesson of Conemaugh, 150.
PROCTOR, JULIAN. The Future of the Newspaper, 122.
Progress and the Post, 399.
Protection for Our Language, 127.
Public Libraries, Are They Public Blessings? 339.

Quackery, How to Suppress it, 760.
Quackery, The Open Door of, 483.

Rapid Transit in Cities, 250.
Real Rights of Women, The, 347.
Reason, Will it Exterminate Christianity? 196.
REED, THOMAS B. Obstruction in the National House, 421.
Republicans, Are they in to Stay? 616.
Republican Tactics in the House, 665.
Rice, Allen Thorndike, Tributes to, 110, 247.
ROOD, HENRY E. A Chance for Millionaires, 761.

SALTUS, EDGAR. The Future of Fiction, 580.
SAXTON, CHARLES T. The New Method of Voting, 750.
Sense of Honor in Americans, The, 205.
Service, The American Consular, 757.
SHALER, N. S. Discipline in American Colleges, 10; The Sense of Honor in Americans, 205.
SHERMAN, WILLIAM T. A Tribute to Allen Thorndike Rice, 114.
Slayer of J. Wilkes Booth, The, 382.
SMYTH, NEWMAN. A Storm-Centre in Theology, 437.
South America, Friends in, 377.
South, The Union Men of the, 635.
Storm-Centre in Theology, A, 437.
Strikes, The Warning of the English, 385.
SWING, DAVID. Will Reason Exterminate Christianity? 196.
SYLVESTER, PHILO R. Taxation or Non-Taxation for Churches, 636.

Tactics in the House, Republican, 665.
Taxation or Non-Taxation for Churches, 636.
Telegraph Monopoly, The, 44.
Telegraph Rates, Are They too High? 569.
Tendencies of Modern Comedy, The, 607.
Theatres, Halls, and Audiences, 429.
Theology, A Storm-Centre in, 437.
THOMPSON MAURICE. Foreign Influence on American Fiction, 118.
"Thought-Transferrence," 126.
THRASHER, M. B. French Proper Names in English, 128.
Throne in England, The, 66.
TOWLE, GEORGE M. The American Consular Service, 757.
Transformation of Paris, The, 326.
Tributes to Allen Thorndike Rice, 110, 247.
Tyranny of Labor Organizations, The, 413.

Union Men of the South, The, 635.

Value of a Book Review, The Cash, 223.
VEST, GEORGE G. The Hopes of the Democratic Party, 539.
Voting, The New Method of, 750.

Warning of the English Strikes, The, 385.
WASSON, J. B. Abolishing Poverty—on Paper, 124.
WESTINGHOUSE, GEORGE, JR. A Reply to Mr. Edison, 653.
What Makes the Actor? 379.
Why Am I an Agnostic? 741.
Why I Am an Episcopalian, 302.
Wolseley Answered, 728.
Wolseley's Mistakes, 472.
WOLSELEY, VISCOUNT. An English View of the Civil War, 30, 164, 278, 446, 594, 713.
Women, The Incapacity of Business, 707.
Women, The Real Rights of, 347.
Word, An Emergency that Demands a, 384.
WYNDHAM, CHARLES. The Tendencies of Modern Comedy, 607.

B. P. L. Bindery.
MAY 26 1911

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.